

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, October 15, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O gracious God, that the lofty words we recite in our proclamations may find a home not only in our words but in our deeds. May the idea of justice find fulfillment in equitable treatment of all people; may the idea of unity and common purpose find fulfillment in understanding and respect; may the concept of honor find its achievement in esteem toward others, and may our belief in grace be expressed in a more civil spirit between every person. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 145, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—226

Andrews (ME)	Brown (OH)	Cramer
Andrews (NJ)	Bryant	Danner
Applegate	Byrne	Darden
Archer	Cantwell	de la Garza
Bacchus (FL)	Cardin	Deal
Baessler	Carr	DeFazio
Barca	Castle	Derrick
Barcia	Clayton	Deutsch
Barlow	Clinger	Dicks
Barrett (WI)	Clyburn	Dixon
Becerra	Coleman	Dooley
Beilenson	Collins (IL)	Durbin
Berman	Collins (MI)	Edwards (CA)
Bilbray	Combest	English (AZ)
Bishop	Condit	English (OK)
Bonior	Cooper	Eshoo
Borski	Coppersmith	Evans
Browder	Costello	Farr
Brown (FL)	Coyne	Fazio

Fields (LA)	Lancaster	Richardson
Filner	Lantos	Roemer
Fingerhut	LaRocco	Rose
Fish	Lehman	Rostenkowski
Flake	Levin	Rowland
Foglietta	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Ford (MI)	Lipinski	Rush
Ford (TN)	Lloyd	Sabo
Frank (MA)	Long	Sangmeister
Frost	Lowey	Santorum
Furse	Maloney	Sarpalius
Gejdenson	Mann	Sawyer
Gephardt	Margolies-	Schenk
Geren	Mezvinsky	Schumer
Gibbons	Matsui	Scott
Gillmor	Mazzoli	Serrano
Gilman	McCloskey	Sharp
Glickman	McDermott	Shepherd
Gonzalez	McHale	Sisisky
Gordon	McInnis	Skaggs
Green	McKinney	Slaughter
Gutierrez	McNulty	Smith (IA)
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Hamburg	Meek	Spratt
Hamilton	Menendez	Stark
Harman	Miller (CA)	Stenholm
Hastert	Miller (FL)	Strickland
Hastings	Mineta	Studds
Hayes	Minge	Stupak
Hefner	Mink	Swett
Hillard	Moakley	Swift
Hoagland	Mollohan	Tanner
Hochbrueckner	Montgomery	Tejeda
Holden	Murtha	Thompson
Houghton	Myers	Thornton
Hughes	Natcher	Thurman
Hutto	Neal (MA)	Torricelli
Inglis	Obey	Trafigant
Inslee	Oliver	Tucker
Jefferson	Ortiz	Unsoeld
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Valentine
Johnson (SD)	Pallone	Velazquez
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Vento
Johnston	Payne (NJ)	Visclosky
Kanjorski	Payne (VA)	Volkmmer
Kaptur	Peterson (FL)	Waters
Kennedy	Peterson (MN)	Watt
Kennelly	Pickett	Waxman
Kildee	Pickle	Wheat
Kingston	Pombo	Whitten
Kleczka	Pomeroy	Williams
Klein	Poshard	Wise
Klink	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Kopetski	Rahall	Wyden
Kreidler	Rangel	Wynn
LaFalce	Reed	Yates
Lambert	Reynolds	

NAYS—145

Allard	Crapo	Grams
Armey	Cunningham	Grandy
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Greenwood
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Gunderson
Barrett (NE)	Dickey	Hancock
Bartlett	Doolittle	Hansen
Barton	Dornan	Hefley
Bereuter	Dreier	Herger
Billirakis	Duncan	Hobson
Bliley	Dunn	Hoekstra
Blute	Emerson	Hoke
Boehlert	Everett	Horn
Boehner	Ewing	Huffington
Bonilla	Fawell	Hutchinson
Burton	Fowler	Hyde
Buyer	Franks (CT)	Inhofe
Callahan	Franks (NJ)	Istook
Calvert	Gallely	Jacobs
Camp	Gallo	Johnson (CT)
Canady	Gekas	Kim
Clay	Gilchrest	King
Coble	Gingrich	Knollenberg
Collins (GA)	Goodlatte	Lazio
Cox	Goodling	Leach
Crane	Goss	Levy

Lewis (CA)	Porter	Smith (MI)
Lewis (FL)	Portman	Smith (OR)
Lightfoot	Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)
Linder	Quillen	Snowe
Machtley	Quinn	Spence
Manzullo	Ramstad	Stearns
McCandless	Ravenel	Stump
McCollum	Regula	Talent
McCrery	Roberts	Taylor (MS)
McHugh	Rogers	Taylor (NC)
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Thomas (CA)
McMillan	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas (WY)
Meyers	Roth	Torkildsen
Mfume	Roukema	Upton
Mica	Royce	Vucanovich
Michel	Saxton	Walker
Molinari	Schaefer	Walsh
Moorhead	Schiff	Weldon
Murphy	Schroeder	Wolf
Nussle	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)
Oxley	Shaw	Zeliff
Packard	Shays	Zimmer
Paxon	Shuster	
Petri	Skeen	

NOT VOTING—62

Abercrombie	Engel	Neal (NC)
Ackerman	Fields (TX)	Oberstar
Andrews (TX)	Hall (OH)	Orton
Bachus (AL)	Hinchey	Parker
Baker (LA)	Hoyer	Pelosi
Bateman	Hunter	Penny
Bentley	Johnson, Sam	Ridge
Bevill	Kasich	Sanders
Blackwell	Klug	Skelton
Boucher	Kolbe	Slattery
Brewster	Kyl	Solomon
Brooks	Laughlin	Stokes
Brown (CA)	Livingston	Sundquist
Bunning	Manton	Synar
Chapman	Markey	Tauzin
Clement	Martinez	Torres
Conyers	McCurdy	Towns
DeLauro	McDade	Washington
Dellums	Moran	Wilson
Dingell	Morella	Young (AK)
Edwards (TX)	Nadler	

□ 1033

Mr. GRAMS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ZELIFF changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 506 on approving the Journal, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall vote 506 due to my participation in meetings on the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994. For the record, had I been present I would have voted:

Rollcall 506, "yea."

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT). The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] for the purpose of leading the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BONILLA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT). The Chair will take requests for 1-minute speeches later today.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating October 21, 1993, as "National Biomedical Research Day";

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1993, and October 16, 1994, each as "World Food Day"; and

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to designate October 19, 1993, as "National Mammography Day."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 to the bill (H.R. 2493) "An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1487. An act entitled the "Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1993."

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 19, 1993, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 537. An act for the relief of Tania Gil Compton;

S. 760. An act for the relief of Leteane Monatsi;

S. 1548. An act to amend the National Wool Act of 1954 to reduce the subsidies that wool and mohair producers receive for the 1994 and 1995 marketing years and to eliminate the wool and mohair programs for the 1996 and subsequent marketing years, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to recognize the International Rescue Committee for its great humanitarian endeavors.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION
AMENDMENTS OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the de novo vote on the adoption of House Resolution 265.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 150, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

AYES—239

Abercrombie	Fish	Machtley
Andrews (ME)	Flake	Maloney
Andrews (NJ)	Foglietta	Mann
Applegate	Ford (MI)	Margolies-
Archer	Ford (TN)	Mezvinsky
Bacchus (FL)	Frank (MA)	Matsui
Baessler	Franks (NJ)	Mazzoli
Barca	Frost	McCloskey
Barcia	Furse	McDermott
Barlow	Gallo	McHale
Barrett (WI)	Gedjenson	McKinney
Becerra	Gephardt	McNulty
Beilenson	Geren	Meehan
Berman	Gibbons	Meek
Bevill	Gilman	Mfume
Bilbray	Gingrich	Michel
Bishop	Glickman	Miller (CA)
Blackwell	Gonzalez	Minge
Boehlert	Goodling	Moakley
Bonior	Gordon	Mollohan
Borski	Grandy	Montgomery
Browder	Green	Morella
Brown (FL)	Greenwood	Murphy
Brown (OH)	Gutierrez	Murtha
Bryant	Hall (OH)	Natcher
Byrne	Hamburger	Neal (MA)
Camp	Hamilton	Obey
Cantwell	Harman	Oliver
Cardin	Hastings	Ortiz
Carr	Hayes	Owens
Chapman	Hefner	Pallone
Clay	Herger	Pastor
Clayton	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Clyburn	Hinchee	Payne (VA)
Coleman	Hoagland	Peterson (FL)
Collins (IL)	Hochbrueckner	Peterson (MN)
Collins (MI)	Holden	Pickett
Condit	Hoyer	Pickle
Cooper	Hughes	Pomeroy
Coppersmith	Inslee	Poshard
Costello	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Coyne	Johnson (CT)	Rahall
Cramer	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Danner	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
Darden	Johnston	Regula
De la Garza	Kanjorski	Reynolds
DeFazio	Kaptur	Richardson
DeLauro	Kennedy	Roemer
DeLay	Kennelly	Rose
Dellums	Kildee	Rostenkowski
Derrick	Kleczka	Roukema
Deutsch	Klein	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Klink	Rush
Dixon	Kopetski	Sabo
Dooley	Kreidler	Sanders
Durbin	LaFalce	Sangmeister
Edwards (CA)	Lambert	Santorum
Edwards (TX)	Lancaster	Sarpalius
English (AZ)	Lantos	Sawyer
English (OK)	LaRocco	Schenk
Eshoo	Lehman	Schroeder
Evans	Levin	Schumer
Farr	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Fazio	Lipinski	Serrano
Fields (LA)	Lloyd	Sharp
Flitner	Long	Shepherd
Fingerhut	Lowey	Sisisky

Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Tanner

Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky

Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—150

Allard	Gunderson	Nussle
Armey	Hall (TX)	Oxley
Bachus (AL)	Hancock	Packard
Baker (CA)	Hansen	Paxon
Ballenger	Hastert	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Hefley	Pombo
Bartlett	Hobson	Porter
Barton	Hoekstra	Portman
Bateman	Hoke	Pryce (OH)
Bentley	Horn	Quillen
Bereuter	Houghton	Quinn
Billakis	Huffington	Ramstad
Bliley	Hutchinson	Ravenel
Blute	Hutto	Roberts
Boehner	Inglis	Rogers
Bonilla	Inhofe	Rohrabacher
Burton	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Jacobs	Roth
Callahan	Johnson (GA)	Rowland
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Canady	Kasich	Saxton
Castle	Kim	Schaefer
Clinger	King	Schiff
Coble	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Knollenberg	Shaw
Combest	Lazio	Shays
Cox	Leach	Shuster
Crane	Levy	Skeen
Crapo	Lewis (CA)	Smith (MI)
Cunningham	Lewis (FL)	Smith (OR)
Deal	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Solomon
Dickey	Livingston	Spence
Doolittle	Manzullo	Stearns
Dornan	McCandless	Stenholm
Dreier	McCollum	Stump
Duncan	McCrery	Talent
Dunn	McHugh	Taylor (MS)
Emerson	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Everett	McKeon	Thomas (WY)
Ewing	McMillan	Torkildsen
Fowler	Menendez	Upton
Franks (CT)	Meyers	Vucanovich
Galleghy	Mica	Walker
Gekas	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Gilchrest	Mineta	Wolf
Gillmor	Mink	Woolsey
Goodlatte	Molinari	Young (FL)
Goss	Moorhead	Zeliff
Grams	Nadler	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—44

Ackerman	Hyde	Parker
Andrews (TX)	Klug	Pelosi
Baker (LA)	Kolbe	Penny
Boucher	Kyl	Ridge
Brewster	Laughlin	Skelton
Brooks	Manton	Slatery
Brown (CA)	Markay	Stokes
Bunning	Martinez	Sundquist
Clement	McCurdy	Synar
Conyers	McDade	Tauzin
Dingell	Moran	Torres
Engel	Myers	Towns
Fawell	Neal (NC)	Washington
Fields (TX)	Oberstar	Young (AK)
Hunter	Orton	

□ 1050

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Synar against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Baker of Louisiana against.

Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. Kolbe against.
Mr. Andrews of Texas for, with Mr. Hyde against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained this morning and did not vote on rollcall No. 507, the rule for consideration of the bill to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 507 on H.R. 265 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VOLKMER). Pursuant to House Resolution 265 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3167.

□ 1051

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3167) to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, to establish a system of worker profiling, and for other purposes with Mr. MFUME in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for the first time.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3167, the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993. This bill extends the authorization for new claims under the emergency unemployment compensation, or EUC program. It also lays the groundwork for a new emphasis on reemployment within our Nation's unemployment compensation system.

Overall, the bill is deficit neutral. In fact, it would reduce the deficit over the 5-year budget period by \$24 million.

The bill would extend the authorization for new claims under the EUC program by 4 months—from October 2, 1993 to February 5, 1994. Depending on unemployment rates in each State, either 7 or 13 weeks of benefits would be provided to new claimants of emergency benefits. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this extension will cost \$1.1 billion in fiscal year 1994.

A total of 250,000 unemployed workers are expected to exhaust regular State unemployment benefits in October. This number is as high today as it was when the EUC program was first enacted in November of 1991. In total, about 1 million workers are expected to benefit from this extension over its 4-month life. The assistance we provide for these 1 million unemployed workers will, in many cases, mean the difference between scraping by or plunging into poverty.

Last Friday's unemployment report should have dispelled doubts some may have about continuing emergency benefits. Not only did the national unemployment rate remain at 6.7 percent, but the number of workers out of work longer than 26 weeks held at 1.7 million, some 300 thousand more than when the program was first enacted.

The bill before us today starts down the road to reform. It includes an administration proposal to identify workers who have lost their jobs permanently and refer them to intensive job search assistance early in their unemployment. This provision will help long-term unemployed workers find jobs faster. It also translates directly into permanent budget savings, \$764 million of which is scored over the 5-year budget period, because fewer weeks of benefits will be paid to these workers.

Some have raised questions whether the savings from this worker profiling provision are "real." I can assure all of my colleagues that they are based on rigorous evaluations of State demonstration projects. Perhaps former Secretary of Labor Elizabeth Dole's press release announcing the results of the evaluation of New Jersey's pilot project is convincing. Secretary Dole said:

Project services significantly reduced the length of dislocated workers' unemployment spells and increased their earnings by an average of nearly \$500. The project also reduced unemployment benefit payments to workers offered services by more than \$100 per person, on average.

Some also have asked how the administration can reap such savings if it does not spend substantial additional sums on job search assistance too. The administration has replied that it can do the job with existing resources and additional appropriations already passed for fiscal year 1994 for the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Program.

Based on the research evidence, I believe the administration can fulfill its promise, and I am willing to give them that opportunity.

The final major provision of this bill would increase, for a 3-year period, the so-called "3-year sponsor-to-alien deeming period" to 5 years under the Supplemental Security Income Program. Since October 1980, the income and resources of aliens' sponsors have

been considered in determining eligibility and payment amount under the SSI program. As a result of this provision, sponsored aliens would not be able to obtain full SSI benefits for 2 additional years. The provision raises \$330 million over fiscal years 1994 through 1996.

This sponsor-to-alien deeming provision will be effective on January 1, 1994, except it would not apply in the case of individuals who are eligible for SSI for December 1993—or whose eligibility is suspended but not terminated—and whose 3-year deeming period ended prior to January 1994. Thus, people who apply for SSI benefits on or after January 1, 1994, and individuals on the SSI rolls—because their sponsors' deemed income and resources do not make them ineligible—whose 3-year deeming period has not ended by January 1, 1994, would come under the 5-year rule.

In this bill, the Committee on Ways and Means acted to address a continuing problem of unemployment, but also took a significant step toward reforming unemployment compensation programs. I recognize that we have more work to do to meet the challenges of the current economy, and look forward to working with the administration as they develop their worker adjustment assistance and other proposals.

Mr. Chairman, 1 million workers are waiting for our assistance. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill and give these workers the help they need.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], to speak out of order.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLILEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

TRIBUTE TO PHYLLIS TROY

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to recognize a woman of great character, of great endurance, and—luckily for me—of much patience; for today marks the 40th anniversary of service on Capitol Hill for my scheduler, Phyllis Troy.

When Phyllis first came to the Hill, Eisenhower was in the White House, cars had fins, and Elvis Presley really was alive. Her bright smile and southern drawl would charm the socks off of any visitor to her Member's office. The long hours she spent there on behalf of the people of Richmond, VA were many and often times her hard work went unnoticed.

However, Mr. Chairman, this did not dissuade her from doing her job and doing it well.

When I was elected to the House in 1980, Mr. Chairman, I was told I was to acquire three things: Phyllis, an office, and a parking place—in that order. As a freshman Member in those early days, she proved to be an invaluable resource to me and the staff—and she continues that valiant service.

Today, Phyllis continues to be a student of the old school. The computer on her desk serves as "an expensive paperweight" as she prefers her typewriter; she still takes short-hand faster than I can get the words out of my mouth; and, if anyone should ask me for an appointment, I simply say, "Have you cleared it with the boss?"

Mr. Chairman, 40 years of service is hard to sum up in a 1 minute speech, but I want the record to show every Member of this institution that in my office is a perfect example of dedication, duty, and determination—and her name is Phyllis Troy.

And, so to you, Phyllis, I tip my hat and say to you something you may not hear often enough—and that is: Thank you. I thank you for your devotion, my wife thanks you for getting me home on time, and the staff surely thanks you for keeping me humble.

If, as they say, life begins at 40, then here's to the beginning of our next 40 years.

□ 1100

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Nearly 2 years ago, Congress enacted the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program as a temporary plan for giving federally financed benefits to the long-term unemployed. At the time, the national unemployment rate was 6.9 percent and had been rising.

Congress and the President were concerned about nationwide unemployment levels. The response was a temporary program to make Federal benefits available in all States.

Today, we are considering legislation to extend that temporary program for the fourth time. However, while economic growth over the past year has been sluggish, the economy has indeed been growing.

This new extension is unwarranted. It's time to allow the underlying Federal and State matching extended benefit system to do its job.

The sense of nationwide economic distress that was used to justify creation of this program is no longer present.

After peaking at 7.9 percent in June 1992, the Nation's unemployment rate has been falling consistently since. The most recent level is September's rate of 6.7 percent. That's below what it was when Congress put in the first temporary program.

Before Members vote to extend it once again, consider what it has already accomplished. By the end of September, this temporary emergency program had provided approximately \$25 billion in Federal assistance in 2 years.

But Congress did more than just extend benefits. We made permanent changes to the underlying unemployment compensation program that

make it easier for State-based extended benefits to become available when a State's unemployment rate is high.

Yes, States must adopt this reform and must share in its costs with the Federal Government, but it's a responsible system for rendering extended assistance in States where unemployment is high.

The expired Federal program more than accomplished its goals.

Clearly, the Clinton administration itself was ambivalent about this extension.

Why else would they have waited until the 11th hour even to broach the subject with Congress, and then keep changing their proposal up until the last minute?

The majority leadership of the House was also obviously ambivalent. Why else let the program expire and then delay this effort to resuscitate it for more than 2 weeks after it has already ended?

The program had an explicit termination date of October 2, and yet there was no rush to consider legislation. In fact, it was allowed to expire when a group of Democrats insisted on cutting out a month of the extension in order to save welfare benefits for aliens.

That effort failed last night, so here we are this morning finally debating a fourth extension. This one is currently estimated to cost \$1.1 billion—but who knows what the final cost will be?

I say that because the total of the previous estimates we were given put the cost of the initial program and its three earlier extensions at \$15 billion through October 2. That program actually wound up costing \$25 billion in that same period, \$10 billion more than was estimated in the original projections.

Only about \$12 billion of the tab was even intended to be paid for when the legislation was enacted by its proponents. The rest was deficit financed through emergency waivers of the budget law and passed on as a debt to our children and their children. I doubt that the estimates for this extension will prove to be any more accurate than earlier ones.

Important questions remain about the bulk of the financing in the bill. In order to generate the \$764 million in entitlement savings from the worker profiling and job search programs, CBO estimates that \$897 million in discretionary spending will be required to administer those programs.

Let me repeat that. In order to get the \$764 million in projected entitlement savings, we will be forced to spend an additional \$897 million in new spending to administer the program. That creates a net deficit.

In other words, the savings on the entitlement side are contingent on future appropriations that exceed the savings.

But the basic problem is with the extension itself. There still is long-term

unemployment in some regions of the country. Yet, high unemployment is no longer a nationwide problem.

Many States now have unemployment rates below 6 percent, some with rates below 4 percent.

Extending this supposedly temporary nationwide program is clearly not necessary for addressing chronic or temporary regional high unemployment.

Ultimately, the responsibility for such a program must return to the State-based system legislated in the last Congress.

My thoughtful and respected colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, will offer an amendment today to address that issue directly by limiting the benefits in this extension to States where unemployment exceeds 5 percent.

It's an excellent amendment that targets the Federal benefits where they are most needed. It should receive broad bipartisan support.

In my opinion, the nationwide economic crisis that may have justified this program has passed. We should allow it to expire before its evolution into simply another Federal welfare program. At some point, it is our responsibility to make the politically difficult decision of saving enough is enough.

Today is that day.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD], chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time, our chairman of the full Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of the EUC bill that is before the House today. The EUC Program, as Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI has talked about already, would extend for 4 months paying additional full benefits to workers who exhausted their regular State UI payments. New claims under the EUC program would be paid from October 7, 1993 through February 5, 1994.

It provides 13 additional weeks for 5 States in this country, and the remaining States that meet the guidelines of the formula would be qualified for 7 additional weeks. Individuals who qualify only before February 5, 1994 can collect the balance of their benefits, except that no benefits would be paid after April 30, 1994.

The legislation eliminates the EUC choice provision allowing certain claimants to choose to receive the higher of their regular State UI benefits or the EUC extension. Beneficiaries must have exhausted their regular State benefits before qualifying for the emergency unemployment compensation.

Over the past 2 weeks, in excess of 100,000 long-term unemployed persons, workers, have gone without. And if we fail to act today, roughly 650,000 workers will join over the next 2½ months those who have already exhausted their extended benefits.

This bill makes retroactive from October 1 benefits to be paid to the workers who are long-term unemployed in this country.

I certainly would urge my colleagues not only on this Democratic side of the aisle by my Republican colleagues also to join with us to pass this legislation, to say to the long-term unemployed in America that we are going to extend those benefits for you through February 5, 1994.

I urge my colleagues to do so, and to join with us to pass this legislation.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, the people we seek to help today would rather have a job than another extension of unemployment compensation benefits. Nonetheless, I believe that it is important that we pass this bill. In my home State of Connecticut, and in many other States, families are still hurting from the recession. This extension will allow families throughout the country to continue to pay their mortgage, take care of their responsibilities, and live as normal a life as possible until they find a job.

While we take this action today, we must consider what action to take tomorrow. First of all, we must take a serious look at the unemployment system itself. Passing short term extensions does help people, but we need to establish a mechanism where this body does not need to go through this debate every several months. I look forward to working with my colleagues to create a system which is fair, and provides people with the help they need.

We must also continue to seek solutions to the problems which have put so many families in such a difficult position. We must continue to work to stimulate our economy and create jobs.

We took a step in that direction with the conversion provisions included in the defense bill. But much more must be done to help not just the defense industry and its workers, but all sectors of our economy.

Mr. Chairman, in the last election, the watchword was "It's the economy, stupid." Today, that is still true. I urge my colleagues both to support this legislation today—and to go on working together toward an improved economic picture.

□ 1110

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. But I say to

my colleagues, I wish we were not here today for this purpose. If the general unemployment rate were the whole story, we might not be; but here is the problem, and we all need to acknowledge it on both sides of the aisle.

While the general unemployment rate is down, structural unemployment remains a major problem. We simply cannot duck that.

In August, 267,000 people exhausted their State benefits. That means people are exhausting their State benefits at a higher rate than when we started the program. That is the problem.

The problem is that while aggregate unemployment is down a bit, there remains this persistent problem of the long-term unemployed. We must not turn our backs on that.

Well, it is said, "Let's use the Extended Benefits Program. Let it do the job."

Here is the problem in simple terms. In 1981, the Extended Benefits Program was changed to make it harder for States to qualify for benefits. Even with subsequent modifications, today, most States that can meet the general trigger of statewide unemployment of 6.5 percent cannot meet a second, stricter requirement in the law. That second provision requires the State's total unemployment rate—above 6.5 percent—to also equal or exceed 110 percent of the State's unemployment rate in either of the 2 prior years. So, it's not enough to have persistently high unemployment, a State must prove its unemployment rate is growing. We've made it nearly impossible for States to qualify for extended benefits. Among the States caught in this "catch-22" are Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, my own State of Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Texas.

Even if these States want to use the 50 percent match available under the Extended Benefits Program, they cannot do so under the present law.

Now, we all agree we have to reform unemployment compensation. We have that responsibility. Some of us have been trying to do that for years, to connect unemployment with reemployment services.

I want an unemployment support system that goes beyond income maintenance. I want a system that helps people go back to work as soon as they can. But previous administrations have resisted—strongly resisted—such reforms of the unemployment compensation program.

This new administration says it wants to reform this system. Let us do it.

But while we work on these reforms, there is no use saying to people who are structurally unemployed through no fault of their own, "Go on the welfare system. Hit the streets. You are on your own." That is not responsible Government action.

The last thing these people want is welfare. I do not want to turn unemployment compensation into a welfare program. We need to reform it. While we are doing that, we have an obligation to continue to help people who are looking for work, who are the long-term unemployed.

We have spent billions already to support the structurally, long-term unemployed. Their need is greater now than when we first passed this emergency unemployment program 2 years ago. We can't turn our backs on these people and their families.

I worry that when we come back in January of 1994 whether we will have enough time to consider legislation to properly reform the unemployment compensation program before this emergency 4-month extension expires. At least let us meet our obligations today.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] seek to control the time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. SANTORUM. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, 13 days ago, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program expired, and for 13 days, action on a bill to extend this program has been held up.

As this House bickers over how to pay for this extension, thousands of my constituents laid off by IBM and other businesses which depend on IBM, are running out of unemployment benefits as they desperately try to find jobs. They are losing their homes and their bills are mounting.

These are people who have worked and paid taxes for their entire adult lives. They do not want charity, but they need our help. Surely, in a \$1.5 trillion dollar budget we can find a way to come up with at least the \$1.8 billion dollars needed to fund a 4-month extension.

Mr. Chairman, I have, in past weeks, urged action by the Ways and Means Committee. I have spoken to the Secretary of Labor, stressing the urgency of this extension for my constituents. And today, I implore my colleagues to support the legislation before us.

I have heard the arguments of the opponents of this extension. Yes, we are seeking to extend what was supposed to be a temporary program for the fourth time. Yes, it is expensive. And yes, the national unemployment rate has dropped below 7 percent for the last 2 consecutive months.

Mr. Chairman, I wish this was true in the Hudson Valley of New York. For years, the counties which I represent

had the lowest unemployment rates in New York State. Despite this fact, I have supported each of the extensions of unemployment benefits which came before this House because I knew there were Americans who needed them. Today, the Americans who need these benefits live in my congressional district and I am asking my colleagues for the help that I, and my taxpaying constituents, gave their constituents in the past.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE].

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House passage of H.R. 3167, legislation extending the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program.

Unemployed Americans are looking to the Congress for help at a time when far too many have exhausted their regular unemployment benefits but are still unable to find a job. It is vital that the House act once again to reassure these Americans that their needs for emergency unemployment assistance will be addressed.

The facts are that there are still over 1.2 million Americans who have exhausted their regular unemployment benefits. While the economy has been improving since President Clinton took office, the national unemployment rate is still 6.7 percent, more than 12 million Americans are looking for work, and it is likely that many will not find employment before exhausting their regular unemployment benefits. These Americans need help from their elected representatives in the Congress.

H.R. 3167 provides that 13 weeks of extended emergency unemployment benefits will be available in States with regular unemployment rates of at least 9 percent, or States with an adjusted unemployment rate of 5 percent. The adjusted unemployment rate includes those Americans who have exhausted their regular unemployment rates. All other States with lower rates of unemployment will be eligible for 7 weeks of extended benefits. For example, residents of Pennsylvania would be eligible for 7 weeks of extended benefits since the most recent unemployment rate was 7.5 percent.

This extension bill is fully financed. The Ways and Means Committee has reported a number of reforms in the unemployment compensation program which will help to reduce the number of Americans who must seek extended benefits because of a lack of employment. This bill requires States to identify workers who, when they first file for unemployment benefits, are considered likely to exhaust their regular benefits. These workers would be required to participate in State job search assistance programs as a condition of receiving unemployment benefits. In addition, the U.S. Labor Department would be required to provide

technical assistance to States in classifying workers who may require job search assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support passage of this emergency unemployment benefits extension bill. H.R. 3167 is needed and it is paid for. I urge my colleagues to vote for passage of this legislation.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1120

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, getting right to the point, I intend to vote for this bill, but, frankly, I do so holding my nose.

The cause is right. We sit around here; we are all employed. A lot of people out there are not, and clearly we have got to be conscious of that. Also, we are in a peculiar phase in the economy. Business is improving, but jobs are not. It is sort of a strange phenomenon going on out there—downsizing, total quality emphasis, minimizing contributed value, squeezing the working capital. So, the impact on jobs is severe, and we may not, frankly, have seen the end of it.

At a recent business council meeting in Williamsburg, the economists, in general, thought that the economy would continue to improve, and run on about a 3-percent increase in the latter part of this year and into 1994. But again this would not extend to increased employment. There are also some downside risks—higher taxes, health costs, and the slowing down of capital spending. But the bottom line for business is tight control on payroll, and corporate strategies focused on emphasizing cost reduction, not price increases. This again hurts the employment situation.

But I must say on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, what we are doing here is absolutely crazy, one short-term bill after another, as if we do not have the wit to think beyond 3 months. I ask my colleagues, "How do you run a \$1.5 trillion institution on a 3-month time schedule?" Also, we have a deficit. We set a budget in place. We have a concept called pay as you go, and now we whisper, "whoops," we cannot make the figures come out right, so we will change the rules.

That does not make any sense. This is one bad way to run anything, and it seems to me that we appear as financial illiterates with other people's money.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly support this bill. There are people concerned out there, and we must attend to them. Although one should never say never, let me state that I will not do this again. It is unfair for anyone else out there paying their bills, trying to work, struggling to make ends meet to

shoulder over and over again this type of responsibility. It is not right.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. A million unemployed workers need help, and we cannot turn our backs on them. But, Mr. Chairman, extending unemployment compensation, as vital as that is, does not get to the root cause of the problems of unemployment, a problem that we have not dealt with effectively.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to deal seriously with that problem, we need to institute a real jobs program now which rebuilds America, rebuilds our infrastructure, builds the affordable housing we need and puts millions of workers back to work, and, second, we have got to stop the hemorrhaging of our manufacturing jobs, the downsizing, the jobs going to Mexico, to Singapore, to the Far East. We need a program which says to corporate America, "Reinvest in this country and not in cheap Third World labor."

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, I, too, yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill. The provisions that were included, crafted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] make it a better bill, much better. However, my colleagues, extending unemployment compensation will not cure America's jobs hemorrhage. In fact, the big news today is that everybody is cheering because the trade deficit dropped to 6.7 percent. Wow, that really sounds terrific. The trade deficit dropped and dropped to only \$10 billion last month. That means we bought \$10 billion more than we sold. Countries will not take our products, jobs are leaving, people are losing their jobs, and the American workers are back home knowing they are losing their jobs because of trade ripoffs. Congress does nothing but extend unemployment.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, our tax policies keep dumping taxes on American companies that are chasing them overseas, and our tax policies and our Tax Code rewards and gives tax breaks to American companies overseas. Beam me up.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, "You will find America's jobs in our tax and trade policies, and we have a chairman with the power to do it. I would hope that he would look at

it. We need that power now. We have had this free trade mentality, and I am for free trade if it is both ways. But look, America is looking for free trade with Mexico. Why not start with free trade with Japan and Europe?"

Mr. Chairman, I am tired of dumping more taxes on people. In fact, I say it is time to modify our Tax Code. Why an income tax? Why not reduce income taxes, couple it with a consumption tax? Every American will probably pay less taxes, and we can tax that underground economy instead of building prisons and giving health care to criminals who get shot on our streets.

I think it is time to look at that, Mr. Chairman. I ask my colleagues to address it.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPELATE].

Mr. APPELATE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] for his generosity in yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the administration wants to pass a North American Free-Trade Agreement. They want to make it easier for Communist China to send in their goods through a most-favored-nation status. They want to open up trade with Vietnam. They want to make it easier for Korean productivity and Thailand productivity to come into the United States.

When is it going to stop? To bring more goods into the United States than we are sending out is going to cost us jobs. Who is going to be left to buy the products if everybody is going to be making minimum wage?

America has lost millions of manufacturing jobs. We have the lowest number of manufacturing jobs in the United States of America since the 1960's. Yes, there is only 6.9 percent unemployment. But what kind of a job are these people holding? Minimum wage and low wage jobs. This unemployment compensation bill is going to be one that is going to help some of those people.

But Americans are losing their jobs. They do not want unemployment compensation. Americans do not want welfare. They do not want food stamps. They want jobs where they can house, clothe, and feed their families, and instead of sending more of these billions of dollars overseas to all these other countries in the world to help them build their economic base I say it is time that we spend the money to build our economic base and help our private enterprise to create the jobs.

Mr. Chairman, that is what Americans want. They want jobs. They do not want low-income jobs. And let me tell my colleagues this, Mr. Chairman: The unemployed in this country vote, too.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, there are almost 2 million unemployed American workers whose unemployment insurance benefits have run out. A number that does not even include the tens of thousands who have lost hope, who are not even being counted anymore. And, in the weeks we have been debating this extension, 60,000 or more unemployed working people a week are running out of benefits.

As some of our colleagues have pointed out, this level of long-term unemployment is higher now than it was in 1991 when we passed the first emergency extension. We must pass this bill today and lend a hand to these working people.

These are men and women who have worked their entire lives. For many, wrenching economic dislocations have left them without the ability to work for the first time.

The emergency extension will give these workers the ability to continue to house and feed themselves and their families while they search for work. Unemployed workers need us to finish this debate and get this bill passed now. I urge my colleagues to vote to extend the emergency unemployment insurance program and cast a vote for our country's working men and women.

□ 1130

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], for the excellent work he has done on this bill, for bringing this bill to the floor of the House fully funded, extending benefits through the holidays to a period of time when in fact if we do need to address this issue, we will be here to do so, and for standing tall and supporting the committee. We saw the committee's unanimous support of this bill yesterday on the rule so we can have a vote to extend benefits for 4 months.

This is the fourth extension of the original extension, but there have been five extensions in total. For the first time now we have an extended-benefits program that is paid for with spending cuts. One was emergency funding, with just deficit add-ons. That was the last one. The first three were paid for with tax increases. This is the first one that is paid for with spending cuts, and it is paid for with reforms of programs that desperately cry out for reform.

This is the kind of thing we need to do more of on the floor of the House, examining our priorities and putting the money where the highest priority is and shifting money away from areas of lower priority. That is not to say that those areas are not important, but they are of lower priority.

So I commend the chairman of the committee again and I commend the committee for its fine work in coming

forward with this bill. It is one that I will support enthusiastically.

There is an amendment coming up that I think will improve the bill even more, and that is an amendment that will be offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON]. What the Johnson amendment will do is simply eliminate the States that have unemployment rates below 5 percent, which is considered by most economists to be full employment. It will eliminate benefits for those States with full employment. If the entire nature of this program is to provide emergency benefits, extended emergency benefits for areas of high unemployment, if that is the rationale for passing this program, it makes no sense to pass emergency extended benefits for people in South Dakota and Nebraska, where their unemployment rates are under 3 percent.

So I think what the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] has aptly done in this amendment is again to do what the committee did in the first place. That is to target resources to the areas of the highest priority and take resources away from lower areas of priority.

So, again this is consistent with what the committee has done. It is consistent with good policy. It is consistent with the original intent of the emergency extended program, which is to target resources for very high areas of unemployment. So I rise in strong support of the Johnson amendment. In relating to the comments of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] insofar as the EB program and trying to fix that program so we can get States to trigger on, I would note that there are two States, one of them Oregon, represented by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI], and the other State, Washington, represented by another member of the committee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT], that have gone out and extended benefits, using the emergency trigger. When we passed this program in the last session of Congress, we did so with the intent that more States would trigger this program and provide extended benefits in States with very high areas of unemployment.

The irony of this whole situation is that by passing this program today, folks in Washington and Oregon will actually get shorter extended benefits, which is a tragedy for those people in those States and whose legislatures and Governors were responsible enough to deal with this problem in the use of the trigger mechanism that was put in law by the Congress in the last session.

So I think we desperately need to look at this program. We need to see what we can do to correct it, to encourage more States to do this and get involved in the emergency trigger without spending a whole lot more Federal dollars to get the encouragement. I

think there are a lot of things we can do with the formula to accomplish this.

Finally, I would just like to say that we are now in day 16 of holding American workers hostage here on the floor of the House with this emergency benefit program. This bill and this rule that we passed this morning were before the Congress 16 days ago. This exact bill and these exact amendments were before us, and they were postponed. They were pulled from the calendar because of special-interest politics. For 16 days American workers who have exhausted their benefits between October 2 and now have been held hostage by political special interests here in Washington, DC.

I would just suggest that if that had gone on under a Republican-controlled Congress or a Republican President, the Members on the other side of the aisle would have been lining up screaming and hollering for something to be done. But not once, I might add, until last night's debate did any Republican come to the floor and demonstrate against that. We patiently waited and waited for this bill to come to the floor so we could do something about the unemployment situation, and all this time we did so, recognizing that in past unemployment extensions the other side of the aisle got up and demonstrated repeatedly about delays and how we could not delay.

Let me read some of these quotes. The gentlewoman from Connecticut said: "These unemployed individuals cannot afford to wait. Quite literally, when the benefits run out, time runs out."

The gentleman from California said: "The reason that we are moving ahead quickly is because there are 300,000 Americans each month that are going on the EUB program. Right now there are 150,000 Americans on this program, so we have to move quickly. There is just no question that this has to be done."

The gentleman from Virginia said: "Nearly 1.8 million jobless Americans risk losing their shield against financial disaster unless we act quickly on this legislation before us."

The gentleman from Illinois said: "There are Americans out there expecting us to act. We are beyond the gridlock that we faced for so long in this bill, and these Americans are expecting us to act."

We saw gridlock in action when political special interests outweighed American workers for the past 2 weeks. I would just ask, where were all these people in the past 2 weeks? Not only did we potentially delay this, we in fact did delay it for 2 weeks. We had States that ended their programs that are now going to have the additional cost of trying to find these people and pay them back benefits. The additional cost is going to be on States that are tightly strapped already for resources.

This was an irresponsible move. It was a move by the House leadership that I think should be pointed out to the American public.

Again I want to commend the chairman of our committee and others who stood up to that and made sure that the bill came to the floor as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for bringing this measure to the floor, a measure that will clearly help millions of Americans in their time of need.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania made a couple of comments that I want to respond to. We must keep in mind the historical perspective, that we would not have this extended emergency program but for the Democrats in the Congress who insisted 2 years ago that there was a problem in the economy, that there were unemployed people in this country who were exhausting their unemployment benefits, and who noted that at first the then President, President Bush, refused to even take note of it, and after months of fighting and hammering on the floor of this Congress we, the Democrats, passed this legislation.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said that economists say that full employment is at 5 percent. Let me suggest to the Members that if you are unemployed, the unemployment rate is 100 percent.

We have a structural problem in this economy today that is not creating the jobs that we need. That is why I am in support of this bill and in opposition to the Johnson amendment. For the same reason that we need to support this bill, we need to defeat the Johnson amendment. There is a structural problem in the economy. It is a national problem, if not an international problem, and it is not a problem that any one State can fix. The exhaustion rate is 250,000 individuals per month, for a total of 1,750,000 individuals who have exhausted their benefits and are on this program.

□ 1140

This is just the individuals. This does not include the families affected by this program. The normal exhaustion rate, Mr. Chairman, of these benefits, is 28 percent. Today it is over 38 percent. So even if the State has a low unemployment rate, below 5 percent, many of these unemployed workers are structurally unemployed. They are not on a temporary layoff. They do not have a job that is going to come back to them.

A person on unemployment benefits is able to work, is willing to work, is

seeking work, and the structural problem we have is there is no job for that person in this economy.

That is why we need to expand this program in every State. In every State these are people that want to work, but, because of our national economic problem, they are not able to find a job, and we need to help them out at the Federal level.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3167, emergency unemployment compensation extension for the 1 million-plus American workers who will exhaust their regular unemployment benefits over the next 4 months. Passage of this bill ensures that unemployed workers who exhaust their 26 weeks of regular benefits after October 2 are eligible for further support.

Under the regular unemployment compensation program, unemployed workers are eligible for 26 weeks of unemployment compensation. But last year, as a result of the recession, Congress had to come to the aid of those workers who had exhausted these regular benefits by passing legislation that provided additional emergency benefits for eligible workers who were no longer covered by the regular program.

However, the national unemployment rate is still hovering at around 6.7 percent. Unemployment in the counties in my district is among the highest in California. In Glenn County, where the unemployment rate is 17 percent, over 1,700 workers are unemployed. As many as 3,500 Yuba County workers cannot find jobs, driving their unemployment rate up to 14.6 percent. Nearly 13 percent of the workers in Sutter and Tehama Counties—over 7,000 people—are unemployed.

Nationwide, there are over 8.5 million Americans who are victims of long-term unemployment—who are still looking for work. As many as 1.7 million of these people have been out of work for over 6 months and about 250,000 eligible workers continue to run out of regular unemployment benefits each month. In July, in California alone, nearly 50,000 people exhausted their regular State unemployment benefits and qualified for extended benefits. Over the past 8 months, over 408,000 Californians exhausted their regular benefits. And, when the emergency extension of unemployment benefits expired on October 2, it meant that they had nowhere to turn.

But this bill will once again extend the authority for emergency unemployment compensation benefits for new applicants, who will receive either 7 or 13 weeks of additional benefits, depending on the unemployment rates in their States. In California, where our total unemployment rate is 9 percent, new claimants will be able to file for an additional 13 weeks of emergency benefits.

American workers need these benefits. H.R. 3167 provides them and, at the same time, pays for itself. As our economy slowly comes back to life, H.R. 3167 enables us to once more reach out and do the right thing for the millions of American workers and families who are struggling to meet their basic, everyday needs. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its final passage.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 3167,

the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993.

While our Nation's economy is gradually improving, thousands of people in my congressional district are still out of work, and unable to find even parttime employment. In September, the State of Michigan had 312,000 people who were unable to find jobs. While this is a long way from the nearly double digit unemployment rates we faced last year, we must not forget those families who, through no fault of their own, are facing the terrible uncertainty of yet another month of electric bills and mortgage payments without a paycheck. It is clear that an extension of emergency benefits is necessary to offer these families a helping hand until work becomes available.

The measure before us today extends the authorization for new claims of emergency benefits from its expiration date of October 2, 1993, to February 5, 1994. The extension will provide 7 or 13 weeks of extended benefits for workers who have exhausted their regular State benefits. States which have adjusted insured unemployment rates of at least 5 percent would be eligible for 13 weeks of extended benefits. The majority of States like Michigan, whose rate falls below this threshold, would be able to offer 7 weeks of extended benefits.

H.R. 3167 requires States to profile workers who apply for regular State benefits, and assist those workers with job search assistance.

The bill would reduce the deficit by \$24 million over the next 5 years. This savings is achieved through two straightforward financing provisions: The institution of worker profiling, which will enable beneficiaries to find employment more rapidly, and by extending to 5 years from its current level of 3 years the amount of time that the income of the sponsors of legal aliens is taken into account in determining the alien's eligibility for supplemental security income [SSI] benefits.

Mr. Chairman, our economy is improving, but hundreds of thousands of Americans still need and deserve our help. The action we are taking today is the right one. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this much-needed legislation.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of extending emergency unemployment benefits that my constituents and people all across America so desperately need, however I support this particular measure with reluctance.

Before I proceed, I would like to give a brief overview of what has happened during the last 2 weeks. When the original version of the bill extending unemployment benefits first came to the attention of this Congress, the members of the Hispanic caucus, including myself, were outraged. The bill contained a provision that stated that funding for the extension of benefits would come from raising from 3 to 5 years the eligibility for aged, blind, and disabled legal immigrants to receive their supplemental security income.

We felt that this unfair and unjust provision subjects legal U.S. residents to blatant immigrant bashing. We should not, and need not, rob Pedro to pay Paul. In addition, by relieving the Federal Government from paying for SSI benefits, we transfer the burden of picking up the tab to our States. For example, the SSI

benefits that would have been paid for by Uncle Sam will now be costing my State of New York \$2 million. The provision also contributes to the anti-immigrant sentiment that is now running rampant in our country, and the members of the Hispanic caucus felt it was necessary that this language be removed. Legal immigrants should not be asked to solely bear the burden of financing unemployment benefits for the entire United States.

As a result of the efforts of the Hispanic caucus, the bill was brought to the House of Representatives yesterday without this biased financial provision, and it extended unemployment benefits until January 1, 1994. This extension would have given Congress until that time to find a new funding mechanism if additional benefits were needed beyond that point, and spared aged, blind, and disabled legal immigrants from having to suffer unfairly. The rule was sadly and regrettably defeated. Its defeat illustrates the insensitivity to Latino concerns and the anti-immigrant climate which permeates this Chamber and the country. Hence, once again I stand in front of you today.

Mr. Chairman, despite my objections, I realize the necessity for the extension of unemployment benefits, but I deeply regret that this extension will be achieved at the expense of our Nation's legal immigrants.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3167, the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993, legislation which would extend the emergency unemployment benefits program for 4 months.

It was my hope when the 103d Congress convened that we would act swiftly on the President's job-creating stimulus plan and get people back to work, but unfortunately this was not the case. Instead, we have now passed two bills which help out-of-work Americans keep their heads above water, not legislation which helps them get a job.

While this bill does not provide benefits for the long-term unemployed who have exhausted previous extensions of emergency unemployment compensation, it will help thousands of Rhode Island families to keep food in the refrigerator and clothe their children.

Although the recession may be statistically considered over, long-term unemployment remains too high—almost 1.75 million Americans are still without a job after 6 months of looking.

My State has the dubious distinction of having the highest number of unemployed workers who have been out of work for more than 6 months. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 38 percent of Rhode Island's unemployed workers have been jobless for over 6 months.

Each week, I receive calls and letters from these individuals who want nothing more than to go back to work. They do not care about business cycles or corporate restructuring or how this bill is financed—they care about their families and getting back to work. If we cannot pass a bill to create jobs, then we must pass a bill that lessens the distress of these families.

We must do it now. The procedural wrangling of the past few days jeopardizes the slender lifeline of thousands and thousands of Americans. To sacrifice their well-being on the

altar of ideological and procedural maneuvers is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3167 to extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation [EUC] Program, which is set to expire October 2.

Although the national unemployment rate has declined in recent months, it remains nearly as high today as it was in November 1991, when the EUC Program was established. In addition, the number of long-term unemployed, those exhausting their initial unemployment benefits, is higher today than when the program was initiated in 1991. Over the next few months, nearly 250,000 Americans will exhaust their initial unemployment benefits each month.

Mr. Chairman, we are no longer dealing with cyclical unemployment, where workers are temporarily laid off during a recession and return to their jobs when the economy improves. These people have been laid off permanently. They must find new jobs, often be retrained for a new skill, and enter a new field. Mr. Speaker, this takes time.

The basic unemployment insurance program is not meeting the needs of these people. We must extend emergency unemployment benefits to provide relief to these Americans whose lives and families have been seriously disrupted by the long recession and the restructuring of our economy. We have an obligation to assist these workers who, through no fault of their own, are still unable to find work.

H.R. 3167 will help these workers by providing an additional 7 or 13 weeks of unemployment benefits, depending on the level of unemployment in their State. This will enable many of these people to continue their mortgage payments, pay their rent or pay off school loans while they seek new jobs.

In addition, H.R. 3167 will provide necessary reforms to the basic unemployment compensation program. This legislation will enable States to assist permanently laid-off workers in establishing their own business and becoming self-employed. H.R. 3167 will also provide the option of short-time compensation to allow employers to reduce hours of employment for a large group of workers rather than laying off a smaller number of workers.

While H.R. 3167 will help in the short run, we must begin to look at making fundamental changes in the basic unemployment insurance program so that it can meet the changing needs of America's unemployed. We need to move from a system that temporarily reduces the financial strain of unemployment to a system that also helps Americans get back to work.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3167, the Unemployment Compensation Program extension. This legislation will extend unemployment benefits for Americans who have been without work for more than 6 months and continue to seek reemployment.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation's economy is showing signs of recovery and job growth. Over 1 million private-sector jobs have been created since January—more than were created in the previous 4 years combined. This is good news, Mr. Chairman, and I commend the

administration for its efforts to continue stimulating the economy.

While the unemployment rate has declined over the past year, the number of long-term unemployed has increased during the recovery. It is these unemployed Americans and their families whom this bill seeks to aid—American workers who will have been without work for more than 6 months and are still looking for a job. The extension of compensation benefits will help these people immediately. The job search assistance program included in this bill will aid these people in the long term by helping them find new jobs.

This emergency extension bill is a fiscally sound initiative. The costs of the extension are offset by the results of the job search assistance program which will expeditiously move unemployed people back into the workforce.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this emergency extension of unemployment compensation and provide assistance to working Americans who are still experiencing hard times.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Chairman, this week, the House will vote on H.R. 3167, a bill to extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation [EUC] Program for another 4 months. As I did in the Ways and Means Committee, I must again express my opposition to this extension.

To extend this program for just 3 more months will cost \$740 million. These costs will be incurred immediately. To pay for this, changes will be made in the EUC program to realize savings over a 5-year period which may, or may not, materialize.

The savings would come from a new system of worker profiling where State unemployment insurance agencies must identify which claimants will likely exhaust their regular unemployment benefits and refer them to job search assistance. This will supposedly put more unemployed into the job search system quicker and result in new jobs before they need emergency benefits. Besides becoming an administrative nightmare, profiling assumes there will be jobs available that can be filled by these claimants. This overly optimistic funding mechanism is the kind of thing that the American public finds most distasteful about Washington. We cannot hide behind assumptions to reduce government spending or even to offset additional spending.

This is the fifth time we have voted to extend the EUC since the recession began in 1991. Does anyone remember the bill we passed last year that was going to fix the unemployment system once and for all and stop these endless extensions? Well, that bill changed the trigger mechanism to make it easier for States to release extended benefits funds. States were given the choice to stay with the old system in which extended benefits are released based on the percentage of those unemployed who are receiving unemployment benefits or go to a new system in which the release trigger is based on the total unemployment rate. This new extended benefits program is paid for equally by States and the Federal Government. During mark up of the bill in the Ways and Means Committee, we learned that only two States passed the necessary law to begin the new program. I am concerned that the reason more States have not done so is because those with high unem-

ployment are betting that Congress will continue to extend the EUC, which is entirely federally funded.

All we are doing is creating another entitlement. The longer this program exists, the harder it becomes to end it and the more people begin to view the EUC as a right. We must remember that this is an emergency program, not a permanent one. This program was created to give the chronically unemployed a little help until the recession subsides. While there are still many people exhausting their regular unemployment benefits, the national unemployment rate is lower today than it was in 1991, when we first established the EUC. And in my State of Nebraska, we have an unemployment rate below 2.4 percent. What I hear Nebraskans say all the time is—cut Government spending. It is time to make tough choices.

Last year, Congress passed into law a bill to fix the system. We must force the States to establish that program and let it work. We must end some programs that, justified or not, cannot continue if we are to seriously talk about cutting the deficit.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, during the 1990's Connecticut has suffered from defense cutbacks, the real estate collapse, and the credit crunch, in addition to a damaging new income tax that took millions out of the pockets of Connecticut workers. Our unemployment rate, while down somewhat this year, was still 6.7 percent in July 1993. Waterbury's unemployment rate was 9.9 percent. As defense cutbacks continue, finding a job is still difficult for many of my constituents. For this reason, I will vote in favor of extending unemployment benefits for the long-term unemployed in my State.

However, it's time for Congress to take a greater look at why unemployment rates are not falling faster. New taxes and new regulations, the result of an indulgent Congress and a permissive President, are forcing businesses to reduce their work forces. President Clinton's tax plan, which I voted against in August, has the potential to eliminate millions of jobs from our economy. And how will raising gas taxes 4.3 cents a gallon help those who need to use their cars to apply for a job?

Rather than giving out more handouts, I want Congress to stop taxing the middle class and begin to repeal the regulatory burdens that are hindering progress in the American economy. The proper way to help people who are unemployed is to get them back to work in the market economy. Few people want to rely on the money of other taxpayers to pay their bills. Let's stop deceiving ourselves that we can continue these extensions forever. Americans need Congress to help U.S. industry create more jobs.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the bill, modified by the amendments recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute as modified, is as follows:

H.R. 3167

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Sections 102(f)(1) and 106(a)(2) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 (Public Act 102-164, as amended) are each amended by striking "October 2, 1993" and inserting "February 5, 1994".

(b) WEEKS OF BENEFITS AVAILABLE DURING EXTENSION.—

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 102(b)(2) of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (vii),

(B) by inserting after clause (v) the following new clause:

"(vi) REDUCTION OF WEEKS AFTER OCTOBER 2, 1993.—In the case of weeks beginning October 2, 1993—

"(I) clause (i) of this subparagraph shall be applied by substituting '13' for '33' and by submitting '7' for '26'.

"(II) clauses (ii), (iii), (iv), and (v) of this subparagraph shall not apply, and

"(III) subparagraph A of paragraph (1) shall be applied by substituting '50 percent' for '130 percent'." and

(C) by striking "or (iv)" in clause (vii) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)) and inserting "(iv), or (vi)".

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 102(b)(2) of such Act is amended by striking "and (iv)" and inserting "(iv) and (vi)".

(c) MODIFICATION OF FINAL PHASE-OUT.—Paragraph (2) of section 102(f) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking "October 2, 1993" and inserting "February 5, 1994", and

(2) by striking "January 15, 1994" and inserting "April 30, 1994".

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 101(e) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking "October 2, 1992" each place it appears in paragraph (1) and inserting "February 5, 1994", and

(2) by striking "(and is not triggered off under paragraph (1))" in paragraph (2) and inserting "after February 5, 1994".

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning after October 2, 1993.

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION TO ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) REPEAL OF DISREGARD OF RIGHTS TO REGULAR COMPENSATION.—Subsection (f) of section 101 of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-164, as amended) is hereby repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal made by subsection (a) shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act; except that such repeal shall not apply in determining eligibility for emergency unemployment compensation from an account established before October 2, 1993.

SEC. 4. WORKER PROFILING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROFILING SYSTEM.—Section 303 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j)(1) The State agency charged with the administration of the State law shall establish and utilize a system of profiling all new claimants for regular compensation that—

"(A) identifies which claimants will be likely to exhaust regular compensation and will need job search assistance services to make a successful transition to new employment;

"(B) refers claimants identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) to reemployment services, such as job search assistance services, available under any State or Federal law;

"(C) collects follow-up information relating to the services received by such claimants and the employment outcomes for such claimants subsequent to receiving such services and utilizes such information in making identifications pursuant to subparagraph (A); and

"(D) meets such other requirements as the Secretary of Labor determines are appropriate.

"(2) Whenever the Secretary of Labor, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency charged with the administration of the State law, finds that there is a failure to comply substantially with the requirements of paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure. Until the Secretary of Labor is so satisfied, he shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 304(a)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking "or (i)" and inserting "(i), or (j)".

(b) PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 303(a) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting "; and"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) A requirement that, as a condition of eligibility for regular compensation for any week, any claimant who has been referred to reemployment services pursuant to the profiling system under subsection (j)(1)(B) participate in such services or in similar services unless the State agency charged with the administration of the State law determines—

"(A) such claimant has completed such services; or

"(B) there is justifiable cause for such claimant's failure to participate in such services."

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Labor shall provide technical assistance and advice to assist the States in implementing the profiling system required under the amendments made by subsection (a). Such assistance shall include the development and identification of model profiling systems.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than the date 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall report to the Congress on the operation and effectiveness of the profiling system required under the amendments made by subsection (a) and the participation requirement provided by the amendments made under subsection (b). Such report shall include such recommendations as the Secretary of Labor determines are appropriate.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4 of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993 (Public Law 103-6) is hereby repealed.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), and (e) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND.

Paragraph (1) of section 905(b) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer (as of the close of each month) from the employment security administration account to the extended unemployment compensation account established by subsection (a), an amount (determined by such Secretary) equal to 20 percent of the amount by which—

"(A) the transfers to the employment security administration account pursuant to section 901(b)(2) during such month, exceed

"(B) the payments during such month from the employment security administration account pursuant to section 901(b)(3) and (d).

If for any such month the payments referred to in subparagraph (B) exceed the transfers referred to in subparagraph (A), proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred."

SEC. 6. EXTENSION OF REPORTING DATE FOR ADVISORY COUNCIL.

Section 908(f) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "2d year" and inserting "third year"; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "February 1, 1994" and inserting "February 1, 1995".

SEC. 7. TEMPORARY INCREASE IN SPONSORSHIP PERIOD FOR ALIENS UNDER THE SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM.

(a) INCREASE IN SPONSORSHIP PERIOD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1621 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1382j) is amended by striking "three years" each place such term appears and inserting "5 years".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on January 1, 1994.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF PRIOR LAW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1621 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1382j), as amended by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is amended by striking "5 years" each place such term appears and inserting "3 years".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 1996.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except the amendments printed in House Report 103-269. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and is not subject to amendment.

Debate time on each amendment will be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 103-269.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. JOHNSON OF CONNECTICUT

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut: At the end of section 2 of the bill, insert the following new subsection:

(f) LOW-UNEMPLOYMENT STATES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR EXTENSION.—No emergency unemployment compensation shall be payable in any State by reason of the amendments made by this section unless the average rate of total unemployment in such State for the period consisting of the most recent 3 calendar months for which data are published before the date of the enactment of this Act is 5 percent or greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, a few short months ago, we passed a mammoth tax-and-spend package in which we said to the American people—these are the resources we need and these are the expenditures we must make to address America's needs over the next 5 years. Yet, here Congress is again having to raise new resources to address needs we knew about when the majority party constructed the budget package. So, since we are now breaking the budget rules and using incredibly optimistic assumptions to find money to pay for the extension in the out years, we should at least be prudent and responsibly minimize the cost of this extension. My amendment does this.

My amendment would simply exclude from the Emergency Extended Benefits Program people in States with less than 5 percent unemployment. When I say 5 percent unemployment, I am using the total unemployment figure, the most generous definition of unemployment and one that includes three groups: The insured unemployment, those looking for work but not qualified for benefits, and exhaustees. Based on the most recent data, this amendment would eliminate emergency benefits in 10 States—Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Utah, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Indiana—and would save \$75 million in 1994. All of these States, of course, will continue to qualify for the 6 months of benefits offered by current law. For extended benefits, Congress has always required higher rates of unemployment as a condition of providing extended or emergency benefits.

All of us understand that, for better or for worse, the various States have economies that are dramatically different. As we debate this issue on the floor today, for example, the unemployment rate is over 9 percent in California, about 7 percent in Connecticut, 5 percent in Wisconsin, and under 3 percent in Nebraska. Clearly, while California suffers from near-depression level unemployment, Wisconsin flourishes and Nebraska booms.

Now I ask you, Members of Congress, how can we possibly justify using Federal tax dollars to give emergency unemployment benefits to workers in a State with 3 percent unemployment? We can't. And our own work and votes demonstrate why.

Just 1½ years ago, Congress reformed the unemployment system. At that time we lowered the trigger granting people extended benefits. That is, when this body passed the Downey amendments to the Extended Benefits Program just last year, we set 6.5 percent as the trigger for extended benefits. We voted that total unemployment of less than 6.5 percent did not justify extended benefits. Therefore, it is fair to say that my choice of 5 percent provides a very generous line of demarcation.

Second, economists now tell us that around 5 percent unemployment is the result of normal, what is called frictional, forces operating in the economy. In other words, 5 percent unemployment is mainly attributable to turnover—people who quit their jobs, who are between jobs, or who are moving to a new area of the country. Levels below 5 percent result in businesses having difficulty finding employees, in labor shortages, and wage inflation. When Connecticut had 4 percent unemployment, supermarket managers were complaining to me that they could not find people to bag groceries. Manufacturers in my district had to put off plans to expand. The labor supply temporarily dried up. Thus, 5 percent unemployment is essentially full employment. So again we can see that the choice of 5 percent for triggering emergency benefits is very generous.

Another way to think about whether States with unemployment below 5 percent should receive emergency benefits is to examine the Nation's average unemployment rate in recent years. In the last quarter century, the average unemployment rate in the United States has been 6.4 percent. The average over the past decade is even higher—6.8 percent. The last time the Nation achieved an unemployment rate below 5 percent was 1973, two decades ago when we had an entirely different economy and very different demographics than we have today. In the last 20 years, the Nation has not had even a single month in which unemployment was below 5 percent.

These figures show that setting the trigger for emergency unemployment

at 5 percent is extremely generous. Defining an emergency as a level of unemployment lower than any the Nation has experienced in 20 years is foolish, wasteful, and fiscally irresponsible.

We simply cannot justify using our tax dollars to extend unemployment compensation benefits in those States with unemployment below 5 percent; that is, in States with strong economies. To do so is to defy reason, logic, and historical evidence. Even worse, especially in this era of oppressive Federal deficits and public needs that outstrip public resources, giving emergency benefits to workers in States with strong economies shows the American people, yet again, that Congress cannot make responsible fiscal decisions and use tax dollars prudently, but is the prisoner of a one-size-fits-all mentality that squanders our resources.

A vote in favor of my amendment is a vote for the integrity of our unemployment system and a vote for fiscal sanity.

Mr. Chairman, I know this is a difficult vote for my colleagues because of the way the issue has been proposed. In the long run, if you cannot vote for my amendment, we will never achieve full funding for Head Start. We have tried to full fund Head Start for 5 years, and still have not made it, because the competing demands for the tax dollars are so great. We will never provide the fuel assistance that elderly and poor people in the Northeast need. We will never be able to meet the challenge of meeting the needs of our people at a time of constrained resources and extraordinary change. We must acknowledge what we have acknowledged consistently every year over the past history of our Nation, that extended benefits in a strong economy are inappropriate. People have an opportunity to get jobs when unemployment is 3 and 4 percent that they do not have when employment is higher.

□ 1150

That has always been the assumption of the work of this Congress. It is always laying behind our fiscal decisions. In a time when resources are constrained and the needs of our Nation are enormous, I urge my colleagues to join with me to support an amendment that is simply fiscal sanity. I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to my colleague who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means that has offered this amendment.

I am opposed to this amendment because long-term unemployed workers

in low unemployed States have suffered the pain of unemployment just as much as those who live in those areas with State unemployment around 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, in the past many of my colleagues have been strong advocates of local area triggers to deal with the problem of pockets of poverty and pockets of unemployment throughout the Nation. Perhaps we should consider this once again, but in the meantime, we should not cut off these benefits for States with unemployment of less than 5.3 percent.

It is nice to talk about, but there are 11 States or 10 States and the Virgin Islands that would be affected by this amendment. I do not think it is fair.

One of our colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], indicated in the full committee a very clear and eloquent message that what happens in large States, when someone lives 300 or 400 or 500 miles from one part of the State where they might be faced with unemployment at 2 percent and pockets of high unemployment 400 miles away that are suffering with 8 to 9 percent of unemployment. It is not fair.

We have had an economic problem in this country. It is not fair at this point in time. If we want to look at the triggers once again, as we try to reform this whole area, that might be all right. But now we are faced with high unemployment in these 10 States as well as the Virgin Islands, as it relates to big States and it relates to pockets of high unemployment.

I would ask my colleagues to reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], and let us move forward and pass this unemployment compensation bill that we can send a bill to the Senate and we do not have to go to conference, maybe, and get this ball rolling and offer the unemployment compensation benefits to those who are in need of it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, this body always fascinates me. It truly represents America. Members can look at things so differently, even two women from the same State with abutting districts.

I cannot reduce this debate on this amendment to facts and figures and arbitrary thresholds. If one is laid off in a State with 4.9-percent unemployment, it hurts just as much as if they were in a State with 5.1-percent unemployment. They have to address their obligations until they get another job.

What disturbs me most about this amendment is that it lacks the realities of life in America today. Downsizing is in. And often, that individual who is laid off is a woman 50 or over. Better to hire a younger worker. It costs less and they do not have to get into that pension benefit.

It is not easy to get a job when one is over 50. But at least if they have unemployment compensation, they can catch their breath. They can get organized. They can think about what they will do next. But it takes a long time to get that job, and they really need those extended unemployment compensation benefits.

This amendment is not well thought out. I really hope that my colleagues will defeat it. It does not make sense.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity recently to read a biography of Charles Dickens by Peter Ackroyd. I want to commend to the attention of the gentlewoman from Connecticut an observation made by an editorial in the London Daily News in 1870.

In his pictures of contemporary life posterity will read more clearly than in contemporary records the character of 19th century life.

I would suggest that this amendment is a good example of 19th century life in Dickens' time, and I would suggest that with the Christmas season coming up, we might want to take a look at "A Christmas Carol."

Are there no poorhouses? Are there no workhouses for the poor? Do we not give alms?

Perhaps the gentlewoman would like to return to the era of Ebenezer Scrooge, to take people and put them into a category where they are dehumanized.

How anybody can come and say that someone is not 100 percent unemployed when they lack a job is beyond me.

An economist is somebody who has a job telling someone else what they do not have one. And when they can come up and give definitions about full employment meaning 5 percent of the people are disenabled from being able to pursue their unemployment chances with the unemployment insurance, then that truly is a picture of contemporary life. Yes, Victorian, Dickensian life, not the kind of life that we need to lead in this time in this country.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

I think, particularly after the last speaker, it is necessary for us to bring this debate back into the parameters in which we are debating. We are talking about what constitutes an emergency.

These extraordinary benefits are coming about in this bill because there exists emergencies in some parts of the country. Clearly, if we have got 4 or 5 percent unemployment in one State, that is not nearly as severe as when we have 6, 7, or 11 percent in another State.

Obviously, 10 or 11 percent unemployment is an emergency; 4, 5 percent is not an emergency.

When we have 4 or 5 percent, we have got less people going after more jobs. There are more jobs out there. But when we have 11 percent, we have got more people going after less jobs. That is an emergency.

So let us not get carried away with Scrooge and the "Christmas Carol" and all these things. Let us get down to the hard facts.

We are here to legislate. We are here to be responsible. We are here not to give away tax dollars but to responsibly spend them.

That is the debate that we are talking about today. It is not talking about being hard-hearted. It is not talking about being a Scrooge. It is recognizing exactly the world as it exists today.

There are different conditions in different parts of the country. The amendment before us is a sound amendment. I would urge a "yes" vote on the Johnson amendment.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. LONG].

Ms. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because if it is adopted, long-term unemployed individuals in my State of Indiana will be denied extended unemployment benefits.

This amendment tells some long-term unemployed individuals that while their neighbors across the State line may qualify, they will be denied the very same benefits.

Furthermore, there are serious questions regarding the way we calculate unemployment and that we are likely underestimating unemployment rates in some States, including my State of Indiana.

I am going to be voting "no" on this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

□ 1200

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I have not been here long. This idea implicit in this amendment represents one of the most misguided efforts I have seen since I got here. The emergency unemployment program is a family relief measure, not a State relief measure. If you are an unemployed sole provider, your household unemployment is 100 percent.

Mr. Chairman, should Congress deny emergency unemployment benefits to textile workers in North Carolina, longshoremen in Delaware, oilfield workers in North Dakota, and workers in seven other States, simply on the basis of where they live? If yes, then you should support the amendment sponsored by Representative JOHNSON of Connecticut.

However, if you believe, as I do, that all workers who have suffered long-term unemployment should be allowed equal access to emergency unemployment benefits, then you must vote "no" on the Johnson amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that a statewide unemployment rate of less than 5 percent is far from a clean bill of economic health as the gentlewoman would suggest. In the case of North Dakota, we have already lost thousands of valued citizens who—in the face of chronic difficulties in agriculture and energy—have been forced to move away.

Depressed agriculture prices, a bust in the world oil market, 2 years of drought followed by this summer's floods have all contributed to serious economic dislocation. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the long-term unemployed people who have stayed in North Dakota and continue to look for work in our State will not be denied the same access to emergency unemployment compensation as workers in other States. We need these people to stay in North Dakota, find jobs in North Dakota and help grow our State's economy. Mr. Chairman, it is bad enough that North Dakotans have been forced to leave to leave our State in search of work—please do not force them to leave in search of Federal emergency unemployment benefits.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's amendment is a blunt instrument that would save a small sum of money only by arbitrarily denying many American families their rightful access to emergency unemployment benefits. The gentlewoman says that workers in North Dakota and nine other States do not deserve emergency unemployment benefits because the statewide unemployment rate is less than 5 percent. Now, in Connecticut, the State unemployment rate may tell the whole story—the individual county rates deviate by less than 2 percent from the State average of 6.6 percent. The picture is a little different in North Dakota. In Slope County, ND, the unemployment rate is 9.1 percent, in McHenry County it's 10.8 percent, Rolette County is 13.7 percent, in Benson County it's 14.6 percent—more than twice the rate of unemployment in Litchfield, County, CT, in the gentlewoman's district. In fact, 16 counties in my State have an unemployment rate of more than 5 percent. However, if Congress adopts the Johnson amendment, workers in these counties, the State of North Dakota, and nine other States would be ineligible for emergency benefits. The gentlewoman from Connecticut undoubtedly knows Connecticut, but she clearly knows nothing about North Dakota and some of the other States where her amendment would bar benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out that unemployed workers in

North Dakota are exhausting their regular unemployment benefits at a higher rate than workers in 37 other States. These numbers mean that unemployed workers in North Dakota are every bit as much in need of an emergency extension of benefits as workers anywhere in the country. If Congress adopts the Johnson amendment, we will slam the door on North Dakota families who have exhausted regular benefits just as readily as families in Connecticut.

Workers in 9 States are barred, and workers in 10 States are very close to the arbitrary limit.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is unfair. The needs of the long-term unemployed in my State are no different from the needs of the unemployed in the district of each and every Member of this House. While this amendment would save some money, it would wreak untold hardship on struggling families in North Dakota and throughout the country. Emergency unemployment compensation is a household-relief package, not a state-relief package.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA].

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this ill-conceived amendment would prevent many out-of-work Americans from receiving the same emergency unemployment benefits as their neighbors. If passed, this amendment would deny any access to thousands of hard-working citizens of this country who worked hard to qualify for their benefits and are in desperate need of emergency unemployment benefits.

The measure targets States such as Wisconsin and nine others where statewide unemployment is currently below 5 percent. This amendment fails to recognize that while the statewide percentage may be low, there are many regions in these States where unemployment is very high and in some cases double the statewide rate. This proposal has many other faults.

First, the amendment ignores the fact that, historically, unemployment declines between August and September. In addition, first-time claimants in Wisconsin have almost doubled in the last year—increasing from 35,970 through August 1992 to 60,586 as of August 1993. So the employment figures that the gentleman from Connecticut proposes to use may not be the most accurate gauge of the employment situation.

Second, the idea of terminating emergency benefits in States with less than 5 percent unemployment is not fair to dislocated workers from especially hard-hit industries. If you are a dislocated worker whose trade is no longer in demand, the fact that unemployment rates may be low is of no solace because you need retraining in order to find a new job. This policy of arbitrary exclusion punishes working

families, who earned this benefit, simply because of where they live.

This proposal does not pass scrutiny when examined on a case-by-case basis. Take for example, the situation in the district I represent. Racine, WI, is a manufacturing-based city with an unemployment rate of 6.3 percent—well above the State's 5 percent rate. In Janesville and Beloit, the rate is also 6.3 percent. Is an unemployed assembly worker in any of these cities any less in need of benefits than a laid-off machine operator living in Connecticut, perhaps even in a county with a lower unemployment rate? Of course not.

Do we really want to refuse emergency unemployment compensation to out-of-work Americans just because of where they live?

American workers are still suffering from a sluggish economy damaged by years of inaction and inattention to growing a high-wage job base. I urge my colleagues to reject this unfair amendment and stand up for American workers, regardless of where they live because emergency unemployment compensation is a much needed relief for families in very difficult situations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] that she has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, if there were any way to make a bad deal better, and I have said I would support this bill, it is to put realism in it. Here we are talking about these percentage figures. I have a county in the district I represent soaring toward 25 percent unemployment. There is where we need help. That is what we have to do.

However, why should the people that are holding onto jobs by their fingertips in that other 75 percent pour money into a State for unemployment that is below 5 percent? It does not make sense. I absolutely support the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against this amendment. Let me share with the Members there may be reasons for having a threshold of 5 percent. Certainly there are studies that are indicating we will never have full employment, but this amendment is not needed. It is ill-conceived to make benefits available at the State level.

In my district I have 28 counties. Not one, not one is less than 5 percent. We have from 10 to 8 percent. If we are going to have a threshold, that thresh-

old should be at the county level. This would be denying the very people we are wishing to get at, those over 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. It is ill-conceived at the level it is proposed.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, what is unemployment? Unemployment is if you do not have a job. What difference does it make where you live? It makes no difference at all. What is the magic of 5 percent? None that I know of, especially in a State like Delaware, which is edging up over the 5-percent level.

The bottom line is that we should not support this amendment, that we should vote against it; that everybody who is unemployed, as has been stated here, is 100 percent unemployed.

If we want a fair system, maybe we should look at the States with the highest per capita income, and they could do more about it, which might affect some other States here. We should not punish the States with good economies, but have people who are unemployed and suffer as a result of that.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members want to have no trigger, then just have extended benefits unlimited, have an unemployment system that provides unemployment benefits unlimited and tax for it. Do it honestly, do it above-board.

If we are not going to tax for it and fund it responsibly, then we are going to have to set priorities, and we are going to have to recognize that people who live in States with 3 and 4 percent unemployment can get jobs, and people who want to produce in States with low unemployment, cannot hire, have to turn down orders.

Let us do it honestly and straight, either have extended benefits forever, for everyone, and tax and pay for it, or else stand by our old system that always required a higher trigger for emergencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD] for 1 minute to close debate.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Kansas does not fall below the 5 percent right now, but we are right at the 5-percent level. The areas that this amendment will affect are cities, urban cores within primarily rural States. For instance, in Wyandotte County in the State of Kansas, the unemployment rate is 8.7 and probably going up,

although the level of the State is right at 5 percent.

Unemployment is unemployment, regardless of where one lives. The suffering is exactly the same. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] for closing arguments.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, Congress must extend unemployment benefits, and it must extend these benefits on the basis of people being unemployed, not because of States that have no relevance whatsoever to this individual family suffering in agony. I plead with the Congress to reject this amendment.

In my own congressional district, which is heavily unemployed, although the statistics for Hawaii are just below 5 percent, I have 10 percent unemployment in one county, 12 percent in another, and these people cannot be left out of this extended benefit bill.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Johnson amendment stipulating that States with a 3-month average total unemployment of less than 5 percent be ineligible for this set of unemployment funds.

This is not an issue of helping Americans in high unemployment States while ignoring those in States with lower rates. I strongly believe we should be helping all American unemployed, regardless of the State in which they reside. Enactment of the Johnson amendment will not deny assistance to any unemployed American.

The Johnson amendment addresses the issue of who pays for additional benefits, the State or the Federal Government. States that are economically healthy do not need additional Federal assistance. The combination of low unemployment and growing economies should result in adequate funds being available in State unemployment insurance accounts. Why should the Federal Government, which is \$4 trillion in debt and continues to have significant annual budget deficits, provide funds when the State already has enough in its own account?

California has one of the highest unemployment rates in the country—over 10 percent. For years, California has done more than its fair share in paying Federal taxes subsidizing unemployment benefits in most other States. Californians have always helped fellow Americans in need, whether they be the victims of Mississippi River floods or devastating east coast hurricanes like Andrew and Hugo.

Unlike many other States, California has not yet recovered from its prolonged recession. Continued base closings and defense cutbacks add further obstacles to economic recovery. My district continues to face very tough times. Unlike most other States, California will significantly and adversely feel the impact of the new 4.3-cent gasoline tax. California can no longer afford to subsidize better-off States. Did California get special Federal subsidies when its economy was stronger? No. Why should other States, especially when the Federal Government cannot afford it?

The Johnson amendment is a very responsible and fiscally sound effort to address this

emergency situation. I repeat, it does not deny benefits to anyone. It simply requires rich States to pay for themselves and stops them from siphoning off scarce Federal funds from truly needy States like California. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Johnson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MFUME) The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 128, noes 277, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

AYES—128

Allard	Goss	Moorhead
Archer	Grandy	Nussle
Armey	Greenwood	Packard
Bachus (AL)	Hancock	Paxon
Baker (CA)	Harman	Penny
Bartlett	Hastert	Pickett
Barton	Herger	Pombo
Bentley	Hoagland	Porter
Billakis	Hobson	Portman
Bliley	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Hoke	Quillen
Bonilla	Houghton	Ravenel
Callahan	Huffington	Regula
Calvert	Hunter	Ridge
Camp	Hutchinson	Rogers
Canady	Hutto	Rohrabacher
Clinger	Hyde	Royce
Collins (GA)	Inglis	Santorum
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Condit	Johnston	Shaw
Cox	Kasich	Shays
Crane	Kim	Shuster
Cunningham	King	Smith (MI)
DeLay	Kingston	Smith (OR)
Dickey	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Dooley	Lazio	Snowe
Doolittle	Lehman	Solomon
Dornan	Levy	Spence
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Duncan	Lewis (FL)	Stenholm
Dunn	Linder	Stump
Emerson	Livingston	Talent
Everett	Machtley	Taylor (MS)
Ewing	Manzullo	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	McCandless	Thomas (WY)
Franks (CT)	McCollum	Upton
Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Vucanovich
Gallegly	McInnis	Walker
Gekas	McKeon	Weldon
Gilchrest	Mica	Young (FL)
Gingrich	Michel	Zeliff
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Zimmer
Goodling	Molinari	

NOES—277

Abercrombie	Blute	Clyburn
Andrews (ME)	Boehlert	Coble
Andrews (NJ)	Bonior	Coleman
Applegate	Borski	Collins (IL)
Bacchus (FL)	Brewster	Collins (MI)
Baessler	Browder	Cooper
Ballenger	Brown (CA)	Coppersmith
Barca	Brown (FL)	Costello
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Coyne
Barlow	Bryant	Cramer
Barrett (NE)	Burton	Crapo
Barrett (WI)	Buyer	Danner
Bateman	Byrne	Darden
Becerra	Cantwell	de la Garza
Beilenson	Cardin	de Lugo (VI)
Berman	Carr	Deal
Bevill	Castle	DeFazio
Bilbray	Chapman	DeLauro
Bishop	Clay	Dellums
Blackwell	Clayton	Derrick

Deutsch	Klink	Rangel
Diaz-Balart	Kopetski	Reed
Dicks	Kreidler	Reynolds
Dixon	LaFalce	Richardson
Durbin	Lambert	Roberts
Edwards (CA)	Lancaster	Roemer
Edwards (TX)	Lantos	Ros-Lehtinen
Engel	LaRocco	Rose
English (AZ)	Laughlin	Rostenkowski
English (OK)	Leach	Roth
Eshoo	Levin	Roukema
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Rowland
Faleomavaega (AS)	Lightfoot	Roybal-Allard
Farr	Lipinski	Rush
Fazio	Long	Sabo
Fields (LA)	Lowey	Sanders
Filner	Maloney	Sangmeister
Fingerhut	Mann	Sarpalius
Fish	Manton	Sawyer
Flake	Margolies-	Schenk
Foglietta	Mezvinsky	Schiff
Ford (MI)	Markley	Schroeder
Ford (TN)	Matsui	Schumer
Frank (MA)	Mazzoli	Scott
Frost	McCloskey	Sensenbrenner
Furse	McDermott	Serrano
Gallo	McHale	Sharp
Gedensson	McHugh	Shepherd
Gephardt	McKinney	Sisisky
Geren	McMillan	Skaggs
Gibbons	McNulty	Skelton
Gillmor	Meehan	Slaughter
Gilman	Meek	Smith (IA)
Glickman	Menendez	Smith (NJ)
Gonzalez	Meyers	Spratt
Gordon	Mfume	Stark
Grams	Miller (CA)	Strickland
Green	Mineta	Studds
Gunderson	Minge	Stupak
Gutierrez	Mink	Swett
Hall (OH)	Moakley	Swift
Hall (TX)	Mollohan	Tanner
Hamburg	Montgomery	Taylor (NC)
Hamilton	Moran	Tejeda
Hansen	Morella	Thompson
Hastings	Murphy	Thornton
Hayes	Murtha	Thurman
Hefley	Myers	Torkildsen
Hefner	Nadler	Torres
Hilliard	Natcher	Torricelli
Hinchey	Neal (MA)	Trafficant
Hochbrueckner	Neal (NC)	Tucker
Holden	Norton (DC)	Underwood (GU)
Horn	Obey	Unsoeld
Hoyer	Oliver	Valentine
Hughes	Ortiz	Velazquez
Inhofe	Owens	Vento
Inslee	Oxley	Visclosky
Istook	Pallone	Volkmmer
Jacobs	Parker	Walsh
Jefferson	Pastor	Waters
Johnson (GA)	Payne (NJ)	Watt
Johnson (SD)	Payne (VA)	Waxman
Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (FL)	Wheat
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)	Whitten
Kanjorski	Petri	Williams
Kaptur	Pickle	Wilson
Kennedy	Pomeroy	Wise
Kennelly	Poshard	Wolf
Kildee	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Kleczka	Quinn	Wyden
Klein	Rahall	Wynn
	Ramstad	Yates

NOT VOTING—33

Ackerman	Klug	Schaefer
Andrews (TX)	Kolbe	Skeen
Baker (LA)	Kyl	Slatery
Bereuter	Lloyd	Stokes
Boucher	Martinez	Sundquist
Brooks	McCurdy	Synar
Bunning	McDade	Tauzin
Clement	Oberstar	Towns
Conyers	Orton	Washington
Dingell	Pelosi	Young (AK)
Fields (TX)	Romero-Barcelo (PR)	
Fowler		

□ 1226

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baker of Louisiana for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Fields of Texas for, with Mr. Washington against.

Mrs. Fowler for, with Mr. Synar against.

Mr. Kolbe for, with Mr. Orton against.

Mr. GLICKMAN and Mr. QUINN changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. DICKEY, SHAYS, and HUTTO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2, printed in House Report 103-269.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWIFT

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer amendment No. 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SWIFT: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 8. TREATMENT OF RAILROAD WORKERS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 501(b) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-164, as amended) are each amended by striking "October 2, 1993" and inserting "February 5, 1994".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 501(a) of such Act is amended by striking "October 1993" and inserting "February 1994".

(b) LENGTH OF BENEFITS DURING PERIOD OF EXTENSION.—Section 501(d)(2)(B)(ii) of such Act is amended by striking "on and after the date on which a reduction in benefits is imposed under section 102(b)(2)(A)(iv)" and inserting "after October 2, 1993".

(c) TERMINATION OF BENEFITS.—Section 501(e) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking "October 2, 1993" and inserting "February 5, 1994", and

(2) by striking "January 15, 1994" and inserting "April 30, 1994".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] stand in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. OXLEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple; it is a conforming amendment to provide railroad workers with the same additional extended unemployment benefits that this legislation provides to other workers. It is only logical that railroad workers should receive the same treatment and benefits that are provided to other unemployed workers.

The reason why benefits for rail workers must be added to this legislation is because they are covered by a

separate program under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. That act is within the jurisdiction of the Energy and Commerce Committee. As always, we have worked closely with the Ways and Means Committee and the Rules Committee to develop acceptable language which carries out the equitable principles I have just outlined and to make sure that railroad employees are not shortchanged.

Finally, I have received a letter from CBO stating that it estimates the cost of this amendment to be \$500,000 in fiscal year 1994. The Railroad Retirement Board has agreed with that estimate. The railroad unemployment program is fully solvent, and financed solely by payroll taxes on railroad employers, so no general revenue funds are required to pay for extended rail benefits.

I have also received a letter from OMB stating that they have included rail workers' benefits in their cost estimates for the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program. The OMB letter goes on to say that, the administration believes that rail workers should be included in the EUC extension.

I urge Members to support this equitable, necessary, conforming amendment.

□ 1230

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to explain briefly the nature of the amendment offered here with respect to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance System.

This system of railroad unemployment insurance is completely separate from the State-Federal joint system of unemployment compensation that covers most American workers. The amendment being offered here today is essentially a temporary extension of the period for which railroad workers may draw unemployment benefits. The temporary extension parallels the changes contained in the underlying bill for workers covered by the regular Federal-State unemployment compensation system.

Because this amendment is essentially a conforming change for railroad workers, it is not, in my view, controversial. Because it is such a minor modification of the bill, the amendment should not affect members' overall position on the bill itself.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I am greatly encouraged by this amendment and the fact that the gentleman is offering it today. I encourage my colleagues to accept it.

This is an amendment which the committee chairman and I have of-

fered, and previously the House has accepted it because it has been included in the rule. Today we bring it up in the spirit of more open rules. We bring it up as an amendment on the floor.

It is very important for the Congress to accept this in order to provide equity for our unemployed men and women who work on the Nation's railroads.

Mr. Chairman, again I thank the committee chairman for offering the amendment.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SLAUGHTER) having assumed the Chair, Mr. MFUME, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3167) to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, to establish a system of worker profiling, and other purposes, pursuant to House resolution 265, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under this rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. ARCHER

Mr. ARCHER. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ARCHER. In its present form, I am, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARCHER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3167, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ARCHER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 302, noes 95, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

AYES—302

Abercrombie	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Andrews (ME)	Dunn	Hoke
Andrews (NJ)	Durbin	Holden
Applegate	Edwards (CA)	Horn
Bacchus (FL)	Edwards (TX)	Houghton
Baessler	Emerson	Hoyer
Baker (CA)	Engel	Huffington
Barca	English (AZ)	Hughes
Barcia	English (OK)	Hunter
Barlow	Eshoo	Hutto
Barrett (WI)	Evans	Hyde
Becerra	Everett	Inslee
Beilenson	Ewing	Jacobs
Bentley	Farr	Johnson (CT)
Berman	Fawell	Johnson (SD)
Bevill	Fazio	Johnson, E. B.
Bilbray	Fields (LA)	Kanjorski
Bishop	Filner	Kaptur
Blackwell	Fingerhut	Kasich
Blute	Fish	Kennedy
Boehlert	Flake	Kennelly
Bonilla	Foglietta	Kildee
Bonior	Ford (MI)	Kim
Borski	Ford (TN)	King
Browder	Frank (MA)	Klecza
Brown (CA)	Franks (CT)	Klein
Brown (FL)	Franks (NJ)	Klink
Brown (OH)	Frost	Kopetski
Bryant	Furse	Kreidler
Byrne	Gallegly	LaFalce
Calvert	Gallo	Lambert
Camp	Gejdenson	Lantos
Canady	Gekas	LaRocco
Cantwell	Gephardt	Laughlin
Cardin	Geren	Lazio
Carr	Gibbons	Lehman
Castle	Gillchrest	Levin
Chapman	Gillmor	Levy
Clay	Gilman	Lewis (GA)
Clayton	Glickman	Lipinski
Clinger	Gonzalez	Long
Clyburn	Goodling	Lowey
Coleman	Gordon	Machtley
Collins (IL)	Green	Maloney
Collins (MI)	Greenwood	Mann
Condit	Gunderson	Manton
Cooper	Gutierrez	Margolies-
Costello	Hall (OH)	Mezvinsky
Coyne	Hall (TX)	Markey
Danner	Hamburg	Matsui
Darden	Hamilton	Mazzoli
de la Garza	Harman	McCloskey
DeFazio	Hastert	McDermott
DeLauro	Hastings	McHale
Dellums	Hayes	McHugh
Derrick	Hefner	McKeon
Deutsch	Henger	McKinney
Diaz-Balart	Hilliard	McNulty
Dicks	Hinchey	Meehan
Dixon	Hobson	Meek
Dooley	Hochbrueckner	Menendez

Meyers	Rangel
Mfume	Reed
Michel	Regula
Miller (CA)	Reynolds
Mineta	Richardson
Minge	Ridge
Mink	Roemer
Moakley	Rogers
Molinari	Ros-Lehtinen
Mollohan	Rose
Montgomery	Rostenkowski
Moorhead	Roukema
Moran	Roybal-Allard
Morella	Rush
Murphy	Sabo
Murtha	Sanders
Myers	Sangmeister
Nadler	Santorum
Natcher	Sarpalius
Neal (MA)	Sawyer
Neal (NC)	Saxton
Obey	Schenk
Olver	Schiff
Ortiz	Schroeder
Owens	Schumer
Pallone	Scott
Parker	Serrano
Pastor	Sharp
Paxon	Shepherd
Payne (NJ)	Shuster
Peterson (FL)	Sisisky
Peterson (MN)	Skaggs
Pickett	Skelton
Pombo	Slaughter
Pomeroy	Smith (IA)
Porter	Smith (NJ)
Poshard	Snowe
Price (NC)	Solomon
Quinn	Spratt
Rahall	Stark

NOES—95

Allard	Goss
Archer	Grams
Army	Grandy
Bacchus (AL)	Hancock
Ballenger	Hansen
Barrett (NE)	Hefley
Bartlett	Hoagland
Barton	Hutchinson
Bateman	Inglis
Bilirakis	Inhofe
Bliley	Istook
Boehner	Johnson (GA)
Brewster	Johnson, Sam
Burton	Johnston
Buyer	Kingston
Callahan	Knollenberg
Coble	Lancaster
Collins (GA)	Leach
Combest	Lewis (CA)
Coppersmith	Lewis (FL)
Cox	Lightfoot
Cramer	Linder
Crane	Livingston
Crapo	Manzullo
Deal	McCandless
DeLay	McCrery
Dickey	McInnis
Dornan	McMillan
Dreier	Mica
Duncan	Miller (FL)
Gingrich	Nussle
Goodlatte	Oxley

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman	Fowler	Pelosi
Andrews (TX)	Jefferson	Schaefer
Baker (LA)	Klug	Skeen
Bereuter	Kolbe	Slattery
Boucher	Kyl	Stokes
Brooks	Lloyd	Sundquist
Bunning	Martinez	Synar
Clement	McCollum	Tauzin
Conyers	McCurdy	Towns
Cunningham	McDade	Washington
Dingell	Oberstar	Wheat
Fields (TX)	Orton	Young (AK)

□ 1256

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Baker against.

Mr. Bunning for, with Mr. Fields of Texas against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mrs. Fowler against. Mr. Oberstar for, with Mr. Kolbe against.

Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote 509, on final passage of H.R. 3167, the unemployment compensation extension. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEMENT. Madam Speaker, regretably, official business in the Fifth District prevented me from being present today to vote on H.R. 3167, the Emergency Unemployment Benefits Extension Act.

If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of the passage of this important measure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTON. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 509 on H.R. 3167 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2520, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1994

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight, October 15, 1993, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SLAUGHTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-295) on the resolution (H. Res. 276) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2519) making

appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, obviously votes are finished for today. There will be no votes on Monday, but the House will meet at 12 noon to consider bills on suspension. The recorded votes on the suspensions will be postponed until Tuesday, October 19. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] has the listing of those bills on the sheet.

On Tuesday, October 19, the House will meet at 11 a.m. Members should note that meeting time. We are meeting earlier on that day for the reason that we have a lot of business on that day because we have three appropriations conferences that we need to try to complete. The first vote will be expected about 1 p.m. on Tuesday.

Obviously, we have a number of appropriation conference reports that will be coming on the floor. On that day the three that Members can expect to come to the floor are energy and water, Veterans Affairs, and Commerce, Justice, and State.

Then the rest of the week we will be meeting at 10 o'clock, on Wednesday and Thursday, and possibly Friday, to finish with conference reports.

□ 1300

As the gentleman knows, the time on the continuing appropriation expires on Thursday and, therefore, we do need to try to get all of these done, if we possibly can, on Thursday, by Thursday.

If we cannot, then we will have to be here Friday.

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, on a motion to go to conference on Defense authorization, will that be up there sometime?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that will be Tuesday.

Mr. MICHEL. And then that Biological Survey Act, further consideration of that probably and those other?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, we will consult with the committee and Members on the other side about the

availability of that bill. We have a number of items here that could be pieced into a schedule, if needed. But our real priority is the appropriation bills.

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SLAUGHTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, October 18, 1993, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, October 19, 1993.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

NOTIFICATION OF MEMBERS BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING FILING OF AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1036

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, this is to notify Members regarding the Rules Committee's plans on H.R. 1036, legislation to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide that such act does not preempt certain State laws. The committee is planning to meet on the measure the week of October 18 to take testimony and grant a rule on the bill. In order to assure timely consideration on the bill on the floor, the Rules Committee is considering a rule that may limit the offering of amendments.

Any Member who is contemplating an amendment to H.R. 1036 should submit, to the Rules Committee in H. 312 in the Capitol, 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation of the amendment no later than 12 noon on Wednesday, October 20, 1993.

The committee appreciates the cooperation of all Members in this effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule for H.R. 1036.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REDUCING SUBSIDIES AND ELIMINATING CERTAIN PROGRAMS UNDER THE NATIONAL WOOL ACT OF 1954

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1548) to amend the National Wool Act of 1954 to reduce the subsidies that wool and mohair producers receive for the 1994 and 1995 marketing years and to eliminate the wool and mohair programs for the 1996 and subsequent marketing years, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, and I yield to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], for the purpose of explaining to the House the nature of the bill.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, S. 1548 will provide for a 2-year phaseout of payments and repeal the authority for expenditures for the wool and mohair programs by December 31, 1995.

This legislation follows up on a commitment I made here on the House floor on September 30 to bring a bill before the House to end the permanent authorization for the wool and mohair programs.

Let me briefly explain to Members how we arrived at this point. There has been some confusion here in Congress and around the country about whether Congress has ended or not ended the wool and mohair programs.

Last night the other body approved and sent to the President the fiscal 1994 Agriculture appropriations conference report.

That conference report sent to the President includes language that terminates immediately all producer payments for the honey program. It also includes the amendment agreed to here in the House to provide full funding of the incentive payments for the 1993 crops of wool and mohair, but no funding for the 1994 crops.

Even long-time critics of these programs agreed with us that funding for the 1993 program should be allowed. This is only fair to those farmers and ranchers who secured operating loans

this year based on the expectation of receiving Government incentive payments early next year.

However, the appropriations conference report only affects the 1-year appropriations bill. It does not affect the underlying, permanent authority known as the Wool Act.

That is why on September 30, I made a commitment here on the House floor—in a colloquy with Mr. ARMEY of Texas and Mr. ZIMMER—to bring legislation to the floor this year to amend the Wool Act and give Members of the House the opportunity to seek further reform.

The bill before us was also approved last night by the other body by voice vote. It is a separate bill to phase down wool and mohair incentive payments over the next 2 years, and repeal the entire Wool Act authority effective December 31, 1995.

I have reviewed this legislation today and consulted with other Members interested in the wool and mohair programs—including those who have producers in their districts as well as those who have advocated complete repeal of the programs.

Madam Speaker, I recognize there are some of my colleagues here and many agricultural producers who believe the current wool and mohair programs should be preserved. I share their frustrations with the often unfair criticisms leveled against these programs.

But I have also come to the conclusion it is time to settle this issue once and for all. It is time to move on and focus our attention on how we can construct agricultural policies to meet today's political and budget realities.

Madam Speaker, rather than keep the future of the wool and mohair programs in doubt over the next few weeks trying to develop a different reform bill, I believe we should move the Senate-passed legislation today.

This legislation appears to be a workable and acceptable compromise. It gives our Nation's 100,000 wool and mohair producers 2 years to adjust their operations and their financial arrangements in preparation for the end of the program. And at the end of 2 years this bill fully and completely repeals the Wool Act.

Madam Speaker, I support and urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I am reminded of an old radio program, TV program called "Truth or Consequences." and in truth, all Government programs certainly need reform. That certainly includes agriculture program policy. But we must make sure the consequences are not really counterproductive and so, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman who in the past has been one of the many Dr. Kevorkians of agriculture program policy here in the House. But

instead of being Lizzie Borden and taking 40 whacks on the farm program, he now has a scalpel.

With a scalpel, he has agreed to what we consider to be true reform on the House Committee on Agriculture but in such a way that will allow farmers and ranchers time to adjust, to honor contracts, to make sure our banks and producers do not go bankrupt in the process.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I thank him for his generally kind remarks.

As the sponsor of the legislation that would have flatly and immediately repealed the wool and mohair legislation, I commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the ranking Republican member for devising a compromise that really accomplishes the objective without hardship to people who legitimately were relying on the policy of the Federal Government for many years in having this subsidy program.

It will be phased out. It will be terminated on a date certain, as a result of this legislation. I consider this legislation to be, in fact, redemption of the pledge that the gentleman made to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and me on the floor of the House quite recently that we would have an opportunity to deal with the substance of the program. It has been dealt with in a fair way, I believe, and in a way that ultimately will benefit the taxpayers with a minimum harm and disruption to the ranchers who have been relying on this program for so many years.

I thank both of the gentleman for their role in this compromise that will save taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars in the future.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I thank the gentleman for his commentary and for the opportunity for us to redeem ourselves on the Committee on Agriculture, which we will endeavor to do.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1548

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SUPPORT PRICE FOR WOOL AND MOHAIR.

Section 703 of the National Wool Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1782) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection:

"(a) Subject to subsection (b)(3), the Secretary of Agriculture shall, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, make loans

and payments to producers of wool and mohair through December 31, 1995.";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking "1997" and inserting "1995"; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(3) No loans, purchases, or payments shall be made for the 1996 and subsequent marketing years, except that loans and payments for the 1995 marketing year shall be paid in 1996."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) Through December 31, 1995, the Secretary shall offer to wool and mohair producers recourse loans under terms and conditions that are prescribed by the Secretary, except that the loans shall be administered at no net cost to the Federal Government.

"(B) A producer who fails to repay a loan made under subparagraph (A) by the end of the following marketing year shall be ineligible for a loan under this Act for that marketing year and subsequent marketing years."

SEC. 2. REDUCTION IN PAYMENTS.

Section 704(a) of the National Wool Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1783(a)) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "In the case of each of the 1994 and 1995 marketing years, the payments shall be 75 and 50 percent, respectively, of the amount otherwise determined under the preceding sentence."

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF WOOL AND MOHAIR PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective December 31, 1995, the National Wool Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1781 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) APPLICATION.—The repeal made by subsection (a) shall apply to both the wool and mohair programs.

(c) PROHIBITION.—Effective beginning December 31, 1995, the Secretary of Agriculture may not provide loans or payments for wool or mohair by using the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or under the authority of any law.

SEC. 4. REMOVAL OF PRICE SUPPORT REFERENCES.

(a) Section 702 of the National Wool Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1781) is repealed.

(b) Section 703 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1782) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following new section heading:

"SUPPORT PRICE FOR WOOL AND MOHAIR";

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(i), by striking "such price support" and inserting "the support price"; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking "price support" and inserting "support under this section".

(c) Section 704 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1783) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following new section heading:

"SEC. 704. PAYMENTS.";

and

(2) in subsection (a), by striking "If payments are utilized as a means of price support, the" and inserting "The".

(d) The first sentence of section 706 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1785) is amended by striking "price support operations" and inserting "operations under this Act".

SEC. 5. LIABILITY OF PRODUCERS.

A provision of this Act may not affect the liability of any person under any provision of law as in effect before the effective date of the provision.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I rise today pertaining to a conference report that will come up on Tuesday, H.R. 2491, the Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development conference report.

I would like to point out to my colleagues, I hope they will support an amendment in disagreement which the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and I will handle to support the Senate amendment which says that we must have the Selective Service System.

The House Subcommittee on Appropriations has eliminated funding for the Selective Service System. This is a serious mistake and certainly I would hope that on Tuesday that the House would overturn the committee and would vote for the Selective Service System.

Madam Speaker, I have 21 organizations, great, patriotic organizations, both military and veterans, that totally support saving this system.

The Selective Service System is an inexpensive insurance in case this country has an emergency down the line. We would not like to have this area of the Selective Service eliminated. This will come up Tuesday.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the list to which I referred.

ORGANIZATIONS THAT SUPPORT CONTINUATION OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Air Force Association.
Air Force Sergeants Association.
American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor.
The American Legion.
Amvets.
Association of the U.S. Army.
Catholic War Veterans.
Enlisted Association of National Guard.
Fleet Reserve Association.
Jewish War Veterans.
Marine Corps League.
Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association.
Military Order of the Purple Heart.
National Association for Uniformed Services.
National Guard Association of the U.S.
Naval Reserve Association.

Non Commissioned Officers Association.
Polish Legion of American Veterans.
Reserve Officers Association.
The Retired Officers Association.
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

□ 1310

FIRST YOU SAY YOU DO, THEN YOU DON'T

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, the Clinton report to Congress relating to United States involvement in Somalia is before the Members today. Unfortunately, this document is a monument to doubletalk.

While President Washington cautioned against foreign entanglements, and Jefferson sought peace through strength, and Teddy Roosevelt cautioned, speak softly but carry a big stick, President Clinton has adopted the theme of an old tune.

"First you say you do, then you don't; then you say you will and then you won't." In the past 10 months he has helped the United States establish the credibility of a banana republic.

First we are nation-building, then we are not.

Next we are chasing Aideed, then we are not.

This week we are going into Haiti, then we are not.

Let me say that even if this administration is as the old tune says—"undecided now," this Congress has a responsibility to define what we as a nation are doing with our foreign policy.

Once again, I call on the chairmen of the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs to hold hearings to determine where our foreign and military policy has been, where we are now, and where we are going next.

HERE THEY GO AGAIN

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, Halloween is still 2 weeks away, but the big spenders at the White House just cannot wait to show us their holiday spirit. Unfortunately, it is mostly tricks and no treats. Remember the budget fiasco, the one that raised taxes \$250 billion retroactively?

In order to secure that razor thin, one-vote margin to pass the largest tax hike in our history, the President pledged that he would offer spending cuts sometime later. That is the treat. But now we read that even as the administration struggles to bring forward a minimal package of spending cuts—\$12 billion over 5 years—they are making plans to spend that money on new programs. That is real trickery. And it

comes today directly from the President's own Budget Director, Leon Panetta, who tells us proposed savings will not be used to reduce the deficit after all, they will be used for new spending. Mr. Speaker, I say enough of Halloween surprises. We already have a \$4.3 trillion debt in this country. We cannot afford this new trickery.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on October 15, 1993, the special order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] be transposed with the special order for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COPPERSMITH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONCERN REGARDING THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY TOWARD SOMALIA

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the lack of consistency in the Clinton administration's policy toward Somalia. This lack of consistency questions both competence and candor.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence, and the words of Clinton administration officials, both prove that the administration has been pursuing an explicit policy of nation-building in Somalia. Yet on October 13, the President claimed in a signed report to Congress that "the U.S. military mission is not now nor was it ever one of 'nation-building.'"

This denial is a weak attempt to try to avoid responsibility for the dreadful effects of the nation-building policy, and of the ill-advised decision to take sides in Somalia's internal disputes.

Consider this history of events:

First, on March 26—well after the timeframe established by former President Bush for withdrawal of U.S. forces—the United Nations adopted Resolution 814, which the United States not only supported strongly but actually helped draft. That resolution expanded the U.N. mission to that of building political and judicial systems in Somalia, and pledged continued United States military support for that effort. In other words, the Clinton administration actually helped draft this nation-building policy which called for a continued U.S. military presence.

Republicans responded by adopting an April 1 Policy Committee resolution to bring all our troops home.

Second, on May 4, command officially was transferred from the United States to the United Nations. On May

10, U.S. troop strength stood at 4,220. U.S. troop numbers actually rose thereafter, to 4,421, by May 26—1 day after the House rejected the Republican-backed Roth amendment which would have pulled U.S. troops out by no later than June 30. On June 6, the Clinton administration backed U.N. Resolution 837, which called for the arrest and trial of those responsible for Pakistani deaths in Somalia—meaning, we now know, General Aided.

The Clinton administration thereafter strongly supported the effort to track down Aided, with Clinton's specific approval to send 400 Army Rangers for that purpose—even though Marine Corps Gen. Joseph Hoar specifically objected to turning our mission into a manhunt.

Third, on August 9, while traveling in West Virginia with the President, Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers said that "we went in there with a clear vision of humanitarian relief and nation-building. They're still in that process." In the same Washington Post article in which Ms. Myers was thus quoted, another administration official said that the U.S. already had succeeded in its original mission of securing famine relief efforts—in effect admitting that their current mission was different from the one outlined by President Bush.

Fourth, on August 27, Defense Secretary Aspin said in a speech that the nation-building mission began in May.

Fifth, by August 30, United States troop strength in Somalia had risen again, to 4,513—and by October 4, it had risen again, to 4,697. Despite all these troop number enhancements, Dee Dee Myers claimed the next day that "we've been in the process of drawing down U.S. troops there since May."

Mr. Speaker, those numbers just do not add up.

Sixth, the next day, the President tried to shunt responsibility to the United Nations for adopting the nation-building policy. "The U.N. shifted course," he said, "and said we ought to stay there until nation-building takes place." Thus, he disavowed his administration's actions in support of the resolution which called for nation-building, and in pursuit of that policy.

Now, after all that, the President tells us that the U.S. military mission was never one of nation-building. And what that demonstrates is that the same administration which said it will not let our troops "cut and run" from danger in Somalia, is more than willing to try to flee from responsibility for the policy that put those troops in harm's way in the first place.

The facts show that the Clinton administration acted explicitly to change our military mission to nation-building, yet now that the policy has led to more than 150 U.S. casualties, the administration wants to deny its role in the havoc which ensued.

The President should take responsibility, admit the mistake, and move on. Now that we have Officer Durant back from captivity, we should do what many of us said we should do months ago: declare victory over hunger in Somalia, and immediately begin an orderly process to pull every last United States soldier and marine out of that country.

□ 1320

UNITED STATES POLICY IN SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPERSMITH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, if I may pick up where the gentleman from Louisiana left off, I hope the million-plus Americans that follow the proceedings of this great Chamber, the world's leading parliament, are aware of the disarray that our foreign policy is in. Finally it is getting personal.

Former President George Bush, being the consummate gentleman that he is, said that he was going to implement a rule not to criticize, and the gentleman from Louisiana can join in on this if he wants to, that he is not going to criticize foreign policy for a year. He has lasted 9 months. He could not help it any longer, because they made it personal.

The Clinton administration at the highest level said their foreign policy shop is run better than the Bush operation. And in Bush's name, former three-star Air Force general, and twice the National Security Adviser to the President, Brent Scowcroft, is in today's paper saying, "I'm afraid that's just not so."

Let me tell you what I found out. For those Americans listening who do not understand what a National Security Board is, and it only grew up in recent time, I mean the last four or five Presidents, to advise a President, and it got big under Henry Kissinger, to advise a President what was happening around the world so that he was not relying totally upon the bureaucratic establishment of the State Department, mostly all good people, but sometimes they get clientitis for a certain country, and get their own agenda. After all, we had two Israeli policies for as long as I was here in my first 15 years.

This is coming to me from a former National Security member, senior uniformed officer. Now under Clinton every single admiral and general, Marine Corps, Army, Navy, Air Force, has been stripped out of the National Security Council. No matter how many degrees they have in geopolitical science, foreign affairs, they are all stripped out. Every colonel or Navy captain is gone from the National Security Council

in the Old Executive Office Building, all stripped out. The only lieutenant colonels left are in the computer section, a technical job. They have all been replaced, and no real uniformed officers have any key policy advising roles over there.

They have been replaced by just what I predicted on this House floor in September and October 1992. They have been replaced by academics, all of the leftwing variety mostly, some of them hard left, all fuzzy academics who have never understood the military culture, who are antithetical in their belief to everything that took place under the Reagan and Bush years. All of them were against liberating Grenada. They have a different way of putting that, or of going after Noriega and of trying to turn Panama back into a democracy. All of them were ho, ho, Ho Chi Minh supporters during the Vietnam war, and that is why our foreign policy is in utter shambles.

Everything you said, Mr. LIVINGSTON, is correct on Haiti. That they would gun down their chief justice officer yesterday on the street, his wife standing next to his body crying, holding his wallet and his watch, and we wanted 200 Americans in there with only sidearms, their Berettas, no M-16 rifles.

And here's today paper, Bill Gertz's personally attacked a journalist for the Washington Times by Madam deLaski over at the Pentagon, and all of the reporters over there, most of them good liberals or moderates, very few conservatives, but they were all shaking their heads that a Pentagon spokesman person, particularly someone with no military background or foreign affairs background, like Madam deLaski, attacks directly a reporter, Bill Gertz, for getting information, which is his job as a reporter, out of two U.S. Senators about General Hoar, CINC commander in chief, Central Command, getting information that over in Somalia and all of the Middle East, that he wanted that armor, and does not want to go after Aided.

Now here is the headline, Bill Gertz' story for today, page 1 story continuation, "Joint Chief Never Debated Granting Armor Request."

"Mr. Clinton said he was told by Mr. Aspin, 'There was no consensus among the Joint Chiefs that it should be done.'" They had not even been asked. They were out of the loop.

Gen. Gordon Sullivan is a good officer. He is not saying anything. But you can tell by his statements to some of our colleagues Monday, "I do what I'm told," that he resents being out of the loop.

We have no remains from two young sergeants, Matthew K. Anderson, and a black sergeant, Eugene Williams. No burial for their families from the crash of the helicopter, the UH-60 Black Hawk on September 25, no remains. The third body came back and had to

go through DNA testing to identify it, another sergeant from the crash, Fernand Richardson.

So we got all 18 back from bloody Sunday, in the wee hours of Monday, we have all 146 from the entire gulf war. Every family had a casket, and had a ceremony. But remains were captured by the crowd and shredded in the streets back on September 25. We should have been ready for October 3.

That is why I am going to try to go to Mogadishu this week, and they said right in my face in the Pentagon that I have to fly commercial, and I resent that, being blocked from a C-5 nonstop flight to do my job.

Mr. Speaker, the small island nation of Haiti has enough problems for an entire continent. But Jean-Bertrand Aristide is not the answer to Haiti's troubles. Why we are putting our soldiers, not to mention our prestige, on the line to help restore this defrocked priest to power in Haiti is beyond me.

Let's be clear. Aristide is no friend of the United States and he is no friend of democracy, even though he was democratically elected. Lally Weymouth, a Washington Post foreign affairs writer, described Aristide as a "charismatic, extremely radical anti-American priest."

Before being overthrown, he not only abused democratic practices but condoned and encouraged violence—especially against his political opponents. The State Department's 1991 human rights report said that while under Aristide there were fewer instances of abuse by the military, "the government proved to be unwilling or unable to restrain popular justice through mob violence." The Catholic church was also a favorite target of the defrocked priest's most violent supporters.

Here is what Aristide said in encouraging his followers to engage in necklacing. He told a rally on September 27, 1991, that if they should see:

*** a faker who pretends to be one of our supporters *** just grab him. Make sure he gets what he deserves *** with the tool you have in your hands [the burning tire]. *** You have the right tool in your hands *** the right instrument. *** What a beautiful tool we have. What a nice instrument. It is nice, it is chic, it is classy, elegant and snappy. It smells good and wherever you go, you want to smell it.

Mr. Speaker, Aristide is not worth one drop of blood from one U.S. soldier. This is just another one of Clinton's feel-good missions that is going to end up getting U.S. soldiers killed.

You know, Clinton wrote in 1969 that he had come to loathe the military. And from Somalia to Haiti it looks like he still does.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, October 8, 1993.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is considerable concern within the U.S. Congress about your

administration's plans to expand the role of U.S. military forces in United Nations peace-keeping missions. Much of the concern results from your administration's failure to clearly define the criteria used to determine when U.S. troops will be committed abroad.

On October 11, 1993, 200 U.S. servicemen and women will arrive in Haiti, with 400 more to follow later in October, to participate in a U.N. mission that is designed to prepare Haiti for the scheduled October 30 return of exiled President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. Because of our concern that U.S. military involvement in Haiti could result in a situation similar to Somalia, we request that you provide us with answers to the following important questions in order to clarify the reasons for your decision to commit U.S. troops to Haiti:

1. What are the vital national security interests that require the placement of United States forces in Haiti under the auspices of the United Nations?

2. What is the mission of the United States forces involved in the United Nations mission in Haiti and the estimated duration of that mission?

3. What is the exact size and composition of the United States forces involved in the United Nations mission in Haiti?

4. What is the estimated cost of this United Nations mission to the United States?

5. What is the precise command and control relationship between the United States forces and the United Nations?

6. What is the precise command and control relationship between the United States forces involved and the commander of the U.S. military command here in the United States?

7. To what extent will United States forces deployed to Haiti rely on non-U.S. forces for security and self-defense, and what is the ability of those non-U.S. forces to provide adequate security to the U.S. forces involved?

8. What are the "rule of engagement" for United States forces in Haiti?

9. What are the conditions under which the United States forces can be withdrawn from Haiti?

We know that you appreciate and understand our concerns about deploying U.S. forces abroad as part of a United Nations operation. We hope that you will provide us with a prompt reply to these important questions.

Thank you for your cooperation and for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert K. Dornan, John T. Doolittle, Richard Pombo, Nick Smith, Paul Gillmor, Dana Rohrabacher, Tim Hutchinson, Rod Grams, Bill Archer, Jack Kingston, Richard Baker, Roscoe Bartlett.

Dan Burton, Jan Meyers, Bob Livingston, Gerald Solomon, Sam Johnson, Jim Ramstad, Chris Cox, Jim Bunning, Carlos Moorhead, Toby Roth, Tom Ewing, Randy "Duke" Cunningham.

Duncan Hunter, Ed Royce, Cass Ballenger, Elton Gallegly, Jon Kyl, Jim Saxton, Howard "Buck" McKeon, Dick Armey, Bill Goodling.

James Sensenbrenner, Wally Herger, John Duncan, Bob Inglis, Henry Hyde, Tom DeLay, Bill Baker, Spencer Bachus, C.W. Bill Young.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 15, 1993]

JOINT CHIEFS NEVER DEBATED GRANTING
ARMOR REQUEST
(By Bill Gertz)

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, according to defense officials, were not divided on the issue

of sending armor to Somalia last month, as the president said he was told last week by Defense Secretary Les Aspin.

"The issue was never vetted by the chiefs," said a military official close to the chiefs.

President Clinton said Friday he asked the defense secretary to explain why tanks and armored vehicles were not sent to Somalia as requested by the U.S. commander in the East African nation and by two other generals.

Mr. Clinton said he was told by Mr. Aspin "there was no consensus among the Joint Chiefs that it should be done."

"And he normally relied on their reaching a consensus recommendation on an issue like that," Mr. Clinton told reporters on the South Lawn.

But military officials said the issue was never discussed by the Joint Chiefs as a group.

One military source familiar with the armor request said, "There was general agreement [among top military leaders] that something the commander requested should be granted."

Gen. Colin Powell, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs, on at least two occasions asked Mr. Aspin to send the armor.

Pentagon officials said the commander of U.S. forces in Somalia, Maj. Gen. Thomas N. Montgomery, on Sept. 8 sent a request for four tanks, 14 armored vehicles and several artillery pieces to Marine Gen. Joseph Hoar, commander of the U.S. Central Command, based in Florida.

Gen. Hoar deleted the artillery and forwarded the request to Gen. Powell, who went to Mr. Aspin with the plea.

Mr. Aspin said the request reached him Sept. 23 and he deferred sending the armor because he did not want it to appear that U.S. forces were escalating military operations. He said in retrospect he would have granted the request based on the heavy casualties taken in fighting in Mogadishu Oct. 3 with militia loyal to warlord Mohamed Farrah Aidid.

A total of 18 soldiers were killed, 77 wounded and three helicopters were shot down in the fighting. A rescue operation was delayed several hours because U.S. forces had to call on Pakistani and Malaysian armored forces for help.

"Gen. Powell did say this is what Gen. Montgomery wants," a Defense official said yesterday of the armor request in early September. "But the whole tenor of everyone was 'gosh, we know this is a tough one.'"

Meanwhile, Pentagon spokeswoman Kathleen deLaski declined to comment yesterday on reports that Gen. Hoar had opposed expanding the mission of U.S. forces to capture Gen. Aidid, but then was not given armored equipment he needed when ordered to do the job.

Ms. deLaski said disclosures of Gen. Hoar's comments at a closed Senate briefing were an attempt to "politicize" the issue.

"We have a very good working relationship with Gen. Hoar," she told reporters at a briefing. "He's been in a couple of times this week to see Mr. Aspin."

A Defense official, who requested anonymity, said later that Gen. Hoar and other Pentagon officials, including Mr. Aspin, opposed engaging in a hunt for Gen. Aidid using military forces when the United Nations ordered his arrest after the death of 24 Pakistani soldiers June 5.

Senior Clinton policymakers resisted efforts by the United Nations to expand military operations in pursuit of Gen. Aidid for two months before sending 400 Army Rangers on Aug. 25, the official said.

But after several Americans were killed when their vehicle was blown up by a remotely controlled mine, "the military leadership said the time has come to try this option"—sending the Rangers, the official said.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 15, 1993]

BUSH AIDES REBUT CLINTON BRAGGING ON FOREIGN POLICY

(By Paul Bedard)

Bush administration officials yesterday rejected President Clinton's assertion that his foreign-policy operation is superior, charging that the White House foreign-policy shop is reactive, ineffective and confused.

Top national security aides to former President Bush suggested that the Clinton national security team is not abreast of world developments, such as the civil war in Somalia, and has fallen victim to changing policy every time the United States gets into a pickle, such as the challenge by Somali warlord Mohamed Farrah Aidid.

"It's not clear to me how they make decisions," said Brent Scowcroft, national security adviser to President Bush.

"The process has not delivered a consistent line on varying issues of foreign policy," he said in an interview.

Walter Kansteiner, Mr. Bush's Africa expert on the National Security Council, called Mr. Clinton's foreign policy "episodic" and on "autopilot."

"It's just unfortunate that they paint themselves into that corner and let it slip away that far before they address it. They could head off a lot of these foreign policy problems if they were on top of them," he said.

Their criticisms came just hours after Mr. Clinton told reporters at the White House that his foreign policy was as good if not better than that of former Republican Presidents Reagan and Bush.

"I've had people who were involved in the two previous administrations say that our national security decision-making process was at least as good as the two in the previous ones, perhaps better," said Mr. Clinton.

His statement was at odds with President Bush's view. Speaking at a San Antonio grade school this week, President Bush expressed concern that the Clinton administration took on a police job in Somalia without a mission plan.

"I just hope that we don't get that mission messed up now," said President Bush, whose administration rejected U.N. pressure to use U.S. troops to police the truce in Somalia.

Mr. Clinton said, "It's easy to second-guess."

At a morning news conference in the White House briefing room, Mr. Clinton said, "The truth is we're living in a new and different world, and we've got to try to chart a course that is the right course . . . while avoiding things that we cannot do or things that impose costs in human and financial terms.

"We have a good record," he said, adding that people who complain about his foreign-policy operation "because of what happened in Somalia last week have a pretty weak leg to stand on."

Mr. Clinton pointed to U.S. support of Russian President Boris Yeltsin and the signing of the Middle East peace deal as his foreign-policy successes.

But critics said Mr. Clinton's policy development is reactive and they point to the situation last week when Mr. Clinton said he needed a few days to draw up a policy for Somalia after the Oct. 3 shootout in Mogadishu between Gen. Aidid's forces and U.S. troops.

The failed raid on an Aidid compound claimed the lives of 18 U.S. troops.

Army Chief Warrant Officer Michael Durant, who was captured in the clash, was released yesterday, prompting Mr. Clinton's news conference.

Experts, saying Mr. Clinton's foreign policy appears to sway when challenged, pointed to:

Gen. Aidid's capture of Warrant Officer Durant ended the U.S. hunt for the warlord.

Congress' challenge to send troops to Bosnia to aid in peacekeeping missions iced those plans.

And an angry Haitian gang's protest in a port city this week prompted recall of a troop ship.

Mr. Kansteiner said the Clinton White House also confused the policy in Somalia by endorsing three different policy tracks—one run by the United Nations that still calls for the capture of Gen. Aidid, a second run by the United States that would let Gen. Aidid join peace talks and a third set by neighboring African nations that could even result in Gen. Aidid becoming president of Somalia.

"They are crossing each other and at times contradicting each other," Mr. Kansteiner said of parallel policies.

"They've been back and forth," Mr. Scowcroft said, and that may be the product of a decision to "put foreign policy on the backburner."

Mr. Clinton's inability to settle on specific plans for Somalia, Haiti and Bosnia, meanwhile, "raises issues about whether the United States has thought through its role in the post-Cold War world," said Helmut Sonnenfeldt, a foreign-policy expert at the Brookings Institution.

To prevent future foreign-policy embarrassments, the White House is reviewing its policy-making process said a senior administration official.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. What happened to our troops in Somalia was a disgrace.

But I want to point out what I think is a solution not only for Somalia or for Haiti, or for Bosnia. I think we have to have a plan. The gentleman mentioned before in his opening statement that the pundits are asking what kind of grade is Clinton getting in foreign affairs, or what kind of a grade is Bush getting and so on. I do not want to focus on that, although I will say this: Clinton is not even in the same league with Bush when it comes to foreign affairs. Everybody would have to agree with that. But I am not interested in the politics of it.

What I am concerned about here is that we are not guided today in foreign policy by any principle or any philosophy. It is all expediency. The problem with that is in a country like this you can only move ahead if you have the blessing of the people on the issues and the initiatives being taken by our leaders. Our Government can only function if it has the trust and confidence of the

people. And you cannot get trust and confidence of the people if you are guided by expediency.

So I would say that for us we have to have certain principals where we are guided by a certain formula. And if foreign issues arise, and they fit into this formula, I think then we should be guided by that formula so we have a road map, so we have a procedure that we can follow. And I would say in considering our involvements overseas, whether we use U.S. troops, I think we have to ask ourselves consistently four questions.

Basically they are these: How is our national security, the national security of the United States threatened? That would be the first question. Second, we have to ask is there a clearly defined mission for our forces, so when we put our forces into Somalia, or as the gentleman here had mentioned, into Haiti, so that we have a mission for our troops, and so we know whether we have met our mission. Third, do our troops have a reasonable chance of success? There are some places in this world, no matter how much power we are going to apply, or how much treasures we are going to pour into that region, we are never going to be successful, because there is no chance of success. We do not have enough leverage in some parts of the world, and that is why we have to focus on this third question.

□ 1330

Is there a reasonable chance of success? Fourth, how are we going to get our troops out?

You know, the thing that has always amazed me is that American troops have been deployed to all parts of the world and we have never asked the question: How are we going to get them out? To me this is a blind foreign policy. We cannot go in that direction. We have got to have a criterion, a plan; we do not today. That is why we are facing all of these little disasters all over the world.

I think that these four questions are relevant. In fact the Secretary of State, himself, has enunciated four questions pretty much like this and we have to have a criterion for us when we are involved so that we can go to the American people or at least the President should be able to go to the American people and say that we are going into Somalia "but here is how I answer these four questions. Here is why we are going in. Here are the chances for our success. Here is our mission and here is how we are going to get our troops out." I think if the President, the Commander in Chief cannot explain that to the American people and to this Congress, then we should not be going into these areas because we are only going to take our Nation down the road to pain, terrific pain.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman and I joined the Committee on Foreign Affairs together years ago, back in 1980. The gentleman has been with him all these years but I switched over to the Committee on Armed Services.

Has the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] been studying this Aristide? Did he come across the statement where Aristide praises necklacing, this former Catholic priest?

Mr. ROTH. I did not run across that statement, but there are a lot of things that I do not have a chance to read because we have been inundated by all this information.

But I will say this that I am concerned. We always say we are for democracy and we are, but if we have a democratically elected leader and it takes the U.S. forces to install him into power, there is something wrong with that. To me democracy means the people are on your side and the people elect you.

I have a question: Is this Aristide really loved by his people? What kind of democracy do they have?

Mr. DORNAN. He is an admirer of Castro, he is a Socialist.

Listen to this statement of the President in the White House press office yesterday:

The truth is we are living in a new and different world and we've got to try to chart a course that is the right course while avoiding things that we cannot do or things that impose costs in human and financial terms. We have a good record because those people who are complaining because of what happened in Somalia last week have a pretty weak leg to stand on.

Is that what he is going to say to the 19 sets of parents and wives and children of those who lost their loved ones a week ago?

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to wrap this up by saying that to me these troops have names and faces and families. They are not just numbers. Even though they have all volunteered for the military service, their lives must never be squandered because some bureaucrat or politician in Washington wants to play the same old game of sticking America's nose into everybody else's business, regardless of whether it is important or not. And here in the Congress all I hear about troops is just facts, figures, numbers. No, these are human beings with names, faces, and families. And we cannot forget that.

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address what I consider to be one of the major domestic problems of

the United States. As we hear all of the problems of the United States it would be wonderful if all of us could just concentrate on single-issue areas and solve those problems, but as my friends have just expressed, we are a dynamic Nation in dynamic times and we have to focus on many things.

What I would like to have the Congress focus on today is the problem that I hear most about from my constituents. It is a problem related to programs like NAFTA. Whether it is downsizing the defense industry; most Americans are asking the big question: Where are the jobs? When are we going to create the jobs? Are they going to be sufficiently good-paying jobs so that the American middle class can continue to prosper and exist?

What I am speaking of today is an initiative that I have undertaken with several of my colleagues in the House, the leadership and members of the administration to address ourselves to that major issue. What can America, what can the administration and what can we in the Congress do to create jobs for the American people who are in fear of the result that may occur if we adopt policies like NAFTA? I think that the only solution is that this administration and this Congress must focus and direct itself now, today, at creating the types of jobs Americans need across this land.

There are many Members of this House who would reconsider their position, their vote on NAFTA as it might come up, if they could go back to their constituents and indeed to all the American people and say, "We have taken positive, active interest in creating jobs to meet the needs of American workers and American industries and American prosperity in the future."

My initiative encompasses many contributions from many Members of this House over the last decade.

It would be remiss on my part not to recognize in particular the outstanding contributions made by the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, in this area, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN]. Over the years he has helped coalesce the technologies of the United States so that they can be better understood. The subcommittee chairman of that committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE], has also spent a great deal of effort in creating a bill, H.R. 820, which has now passed the House and is pending in the other body, which hopes to open up some of these new technologies to improve the competitiveness of the United States.

What my initiative does is build on what they have now contributed. It develops a comprehensive program so that we can meet the needs of American workers and we can use the one tool that we have left out in the American structure of our economy thus far,

and that is utilizing the marketing and commercialization know-how of the private-enterprise system in America.

Mr. Speaker, since 1964 the United States of America has developed and researched more than 1.5 million new technologies. We have pending in progress right now the development of 140,000 new technologies and research and development programs.

Yet if a private businessman in America wants to find out where they are, how he can find out about them, what he can do, he has to come to a beltway consultant, a big-time expensive lawyer, and spend years of effort, time, and money to search out where the technologies are, what they do, how relevant they are to commercialization and then hope he can enter into an agreement with the U.S. Government or any of its departments, agencies, bureaus, national laboratories, or universities and then try to finance getting into business.

By that time he has spent years and millions of dollars and has created great frustration for himself and for the system.

The initiative I wish to suggest to the Congress has a multifaceted set of legs to it. Basically they are four.

What we have to do in the United States is be intelligent enough to organize a data base that encompasses all the technologies, patents, licenses, processes that the U.S. Government has spent \$2 trillion on developing in the last 30 years, into one central data base where it is easily and user friendly, accessible to American business and entrepreneurs, particularly small- and medium-sized businessmen. Where businessmen can either enlarge their operation or start new businesses with modern emerging technologies to create greater wealth, and most of all, better and higher-paying jobs.

I have spoken with, and met with, the Department of Commerce over the last several months and they have indicated to me that they have the capacity to accomplish this goal of a centralized technology data base in about 1 year. So we can have a data base available where any one single individual, businessman, entrepreneur, or industry can find out everything that exists in the inventory of the United States in new technologies that might be helpful to him. This goal will be accomplished.

The next leg of what I propose is something we have never done before, and that is look to the private sector to learn how they market products in America. The private sector does not market products by hiding them, it does not market things by scattering them around to hundreds of agencies, 58 national laboratories, 1,600 colleges and universities, where it would take a lifetime to ferret out what is there.

Instead American business uses the modern methods of marketing and

technology. One of the major legs of the technology development that we are talking about in this initiative is to create what I call the American technology network. It would be an organized and specialized network like Discovery, or CNN, or any of the commercial networks that are presently on the air. It would concentrate on developing sane, simple, and entertaining ways of presenting new ideas and new technologies ready for commercialization to the entire American population at their will.

□ 1340

For 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, we could literally identify from the Federal inventory of patents, licenses and processes, and technology, the most likely 6,000 that could be immediately commercialized. We could put them in understandable, entertaining form in 1-minute, 3-minute, 5-minute intervals, that could be presented to the entire listening audience of the United States, not unlike C-SPAN which the House of Representatives takes part in its debate, where 7, 8, 10 million people at their will, at their election, could see what the American inventory is offering to the American people, the taxpayer money that has already been paid for this research and development and hopefully how they could access it easily and develop it into new businesses that would create the jobs we need in America.

We estimate that by creating The American Technology Network, we can in fact create enough new jobs to employ half a million people a year for the next 5 years. At that rate, including indirect jobs, we could actually create a million jobs a year in new technologies, new patents, things that are not even being worked on, but have been developed and have been paid for by American taxpayer money that are laying around the vaults of all the Departments, Agencies, and Bureaus of the Federal Government, the 58 national laboratories that are constantly the brain power of research and development of the American Government, and in hundreds of colleges and universities, ideas whose time has come and in some instances has passed, but should be developed and commercialized that presently are not being commercialized.

Together with the American Technology Network, a corporation known as the Technology Transfer Corporation could be created and authorized and contracted with the Department of Commerce to be the exclusive and sole agent of the U.S. Government in dispersing the contract arrangements that are necessary with entrepreneurs and businessmen across America who want to license this technology and start into business, creating a one-stop shopping operation. If you say a technology that interested you and you

were in business or wanted to go in business, you could call a contracting officer in the Technology Transfer Corporation and that individual's job would be to enter into an agreement or try to find out whether you are capable of promoting that technology and using it, contract for it and get you started on the way and give you any technical assistance that the Government can offer to help you develop that business or that technology.

What would that encompass? It would be using the market system.

And would these be bureaucrats? No, they would not be bureaucrats. The Technology Transfer Corporation should be a private corporation.

Should the Government own part of it? Yes. That is the methodology by which we would get paid back if these technologies are successful in the marketplace, by taking as equity interest.

But first and foremost, the intention of this initiative is to make this technology available to the American people easily and readily so they can pull it up; first be excited by what they saw on the American Technology Network, then interfaced by their personal computers into the comprehensive data bank, receive any amount of information they need on what that technology calls for, make the depthful analysis that is necessary before they start their business, and then have one contracting officer who represents and is the agent for the U.S. Government to sell or negotiate the licensing of that technology to them.

Rather than spending half a million or a million dollars, success could be accomplished with little or very little money on the part of an entrepreneur or small businessman. They could then in a relatively short period of time of months rather than years acquire the rights to proceed with the development of that technology in a small business and they would be on their way.

The fourth leg of this proposal is a vehicle to help provide the venture capital money necessary by small businessmen and entrepreneurs to get their new businesses started.

It is a sin in this country that we are willing to create the Hungarian Fund for \$400 million, the Russian Fund for \$700 million with American taxpayers' money, with the intention of developing the economies of these foreign countries who have their needs, and yet we forget that American business, American entrepreneurs, American dislocated workers also have a need and have a right to capital access here in the United States to develop American products of research and development.

Right now the largest user of American technology and development and research happens to be the Japanese industrial market. Why? Because they have the specialists who live right here in Washington that search out the patents and the technologies and the proc-

esses that the U.S. Government develops at taxpayer expense, and they go through the process of licensing them or contracting for those processes from the U.S. Government and they take them back to their home country and develop them into worthwhile technologies and businesses that not only encourage and make money and wealth in the country of Japan, but are used to transport around the world, and indeed sell many of their products right here in the United States that were developed by Federal moneys right here in the United States.

What the financing vehicle would be is very simple. For a price of less than \$3 billion a year we could underwrite a venture capital fund working in conjunction with the Technology Transfer Corporation that could make available a million dollars of venture capital to virtually any entrepreneur or small businessman in the United States who wants to get involved, expand his business or start a new business.

If we did that, that \$3 billion could be leveraged to create a fund of \$12 billion per year, because our experience with the Economic Development Administration was that for 25 percent of the risk covered, the Economic Development Administration could lend out four times the amount of money and not lose any money for the U.S. Government.

That means for the infusion of \$3 billion of American capital, governmental taxpayers' money into the fund that would allow this expansion, we could create a pool of venture capital of \$12 billion a year, and if you loaned out a million dollars to a venture capital organization or an innovator or small businessman or an entrepreneur, you could create 12,000 \$1 million small businesses every year.

The mathematics in business says that for a venture capitalist who uses \$1 million, he can create easily 20 high-paying jobs. I am not talking about \$5, \$6, or \$7 an hour jobs. I am talking about \$15, \$20, \$25 an hour jobs, good jobs.

If we created 12,000 new businesses a year with 20 jobs each, that is 480,000 new jobs in America. That is the direct jobs by the investment that would be made. The indirect creation of jobs would be at least a one-to-one ratio, another 480,000 jobs, for a grand total of 960,000 new jobs a year with new technology, creating new wealth and solving problems in new ways for America, making the country and the economy more wealthy, making the country respond and get back its capital that it has invested in research and development; but most of all, Mr. Speaker, creating those jobs that the average American asks about.

Everywhere I go in my district in the State of Pennsylvania or the United States, when we talk about NAFTA, when we talk about retraining programs, when we talk about downsizing

the military and the defense industry and the job losses those activities will create or the need for retraining, the question is, where are the jobs we are going to retrain these people for? It is fun to retrain people, but to retrain them and not have a job for them is not a very successful thing for the government to do. Many people who go through retraining are frustrated to find out that they have been retrained for a job that does not exist.

What I suggest is that if we focus and mobilize our effort and create first of all a data bank of all the technologies that exist in the American inventory, the American Government inventory, make it accessible, make it public knowledge by marketing using the tool we Americans know best, American television, if anybody and everybody in America has an equal opportunity to find out what is available and what is for sale in the American inventory, and then we have a technology transfer corporation where an individual does not have to hire a Philadelphia lawyer and a Washington consultant to find out how to negotiate for it, but can talk to a single contract officer with the authority to act and simple user-friendly contracts and forms to develop a new business.

Then finally, Mr. Speaker, that corporation would be largely owned by the U.S. Government so that its success would return money back to the U.S. Government, so we could increase and continue the program indefinitely.

□ 1350

After 5 years, Mr. Speaker, it would become a self-financing tool to help create new American research and development firms. It would reach out to the American workplace and out to the entrepreneurial spirits in America to create new jobs. Finally, we would have tools that could make all of us part of the package with American capitalism, with democratic capitalism. The American Government could have an equity interest in some of those businesses that would return a great deal.

But, forgetting all that and the potential profit to the government from that endeavor, the estimates and studies that we have run on this concept, if we are successful, would generate over 10 years \$140 billion in new taxes to the Treasury of the United States. And for what cost? Just focusing, paying attention and doing what government does well: Fund research and development, encourage growth and exploration in the new ideas and fields, but then also, recognizing that the magic of America is in the private market, the private marketing concepts, and take the best tools of the private free enterprise system in America, and put them to work with government to accomplish this end.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I certainly will.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] for yielding, and I want to compliment him on his statement. He is one of those Members who is far-sighted and prescient in this area, and we appreciate that because I think the thinking anew and acting anew, as I see his legislation, I think that is the step that we have to take.

I was impressed. The gentleman mentioned several times the word "focus," and I think that is important because we are too defocused many times here in the Congress.

When Greenspan: the gentleman is one of the Members here in the Congress who understands the Federal Reserve, and the economy and so on, when Greenspan was, Alan Greenspan, head of the Federal Reserve, was before our Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, he mentioned that if we want jobs, then we have to focus, and he used the gentleman's word "focus" on entrepreneurs and risk takers, not to impede them.

Now the question I have for the gentleman is this, and it is a friendly question because I agree with him:

The Japanese are over here picking up all of our technology. We are spending money to produce it, and they are using it. Here in Washington 80 percent of all of our gross national product increase last year was due to trade, and, yes, we have got, for example, seven agencies that are dealing with trade. I mean it is so defocused. There is nowhere to go. Go to Commerce, go to Defense, go to Treasury—I mean seven different agencies; they are falling over each other's luggage at the Tokyo International Airport, and I think that we have got to get our policy more focused.

I think that we are having too much government and too many regulations, and I would ask the gentleman how his legislation would address that problem, unless he does not see that as a problem.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, I see it as a great problem, and it is exactly the problem that we are trying to address. What exists right now in the technology transfer field in the United States is we have encouraged and made a mandate in Congress; as a matter of fact, in law, saying that you not only have to research, and develop and create these new technologies, but you must find a way to market them to the free market system so that it can take them on, and indeed some of the national laboratories have started to do this, some of the universities have started as well. The only problem is that every one of the 58 national laboratories have their own marketing program. Every one of the 1,600 colleges and universities that do research are called upon to develop their own marketing program. Every agency, bu-

reau and department of the United States has its own marketing program.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the tool that I am suggesting will probably end up saving and costing less money to accomplish a more successful end result because we bring together all of that material that is out there, scattered in these many entities, and bring it into one data base, and, once it is in that data base, we have a marketing technique. It is the best of private sector marketing and we have one corporation to handle the licensing process to move it through quickly, and one effective financing vehicle to get the job done.

If I may answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin, we were just talking on the floor the other day about this issue with members of the Committee on Education and Labor. There are 124 retraining programs in the U.S. Government. It is a massive array. I ask:

Why can't we start looking to the billions of dollars that we spend in this area, and, rather than requiring the average small or medium sized businessman to hire a consultant to find out how you get into the safe, they can't even find out how to get access to our retraining programs and, rather than doing that, why don't we simplify the process? Why don't we try to centralize it?

Now we cannot centralize everything down to one single entity, but we can certainly start on the process, knowing what we have to do, of creating one uniform base of information and then authorizing marketing techniques that are derived from the experience of the private sector, the way we reach people, and then central negotiating to be handled by one person rather than having the fractured elements of many, many agencies and bureaus having to deal and sign off or enter agency agreements, as we have now, causing terrible problems.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding, and I do not want to be in any way confrontational here because I agree with what the gentleman is trying to do. I would just like to repeat or would like to mention an experience that I had a few short years ago.

I am very much concerned about trade, like the gentleman is, for example, because, as the gentleman knows, we are living in a dynamic world economy, and we have got to be competitive in the area of trade. But from my experience here in the Congress, as the gentleman knows we have so many different departments: We have got the USTR, we got Commerce, we got Treasury—as the gentleman knows, all down the line, and what I and some of the other Congressmen and Senators want to do is to have one department on trade. You know, like you had mentioned, they get some focus so we can

add more focus to it, but we could never get our departments together.

We went as far as the White House, and the President agreed with us, and then on a Friday morning, when the news conference was supposed to be held, why there was such a ruckus within the Departments themselves that even the President backed off, and my concern is, when we get the government involved, we get all these different entities involved, and we never get anything accomplished. This causes a lot of costs, a lot of money, causes a lot of friction and confrontation, and the job never gets done, and the Japanese and other countries are running off with the jobs and the technology, and my question basically with the initiative the gentleman is taking is:

What can we do to get some focus, to use the gentleman's word, some focus to what we are trying to do here in government, like have one department of trade, have one agency that works, for example, with small business and so on? As it is set up now, my good friend from Pennsylvania, I do not know who to go to in government. I go to 50, as the gentleman knows, different agencies. You keep on getting the run-around because there is nobody you can focus on.

Mr. KANJORSKI. As my good friend, Mr. Pogo, used to say, "I have met the enemy, and he is us." We, too, have this problem of jurisdiction within the Congress itself. Recently one of the leading members of this body who sat with me recently, said in order to come up with an idea and sell it sometimes it takes decades. That is unfortunate because we have to filter through all these jurisdictional areas and find out who we rob and whose jurisdictional we are into. What we have got to stop doing is thinking of how government operates and start approaching this problem how the man on the street, and the average American, the average entrepreneur and the average businessman need us to operate. We cannot do things totally and simplistically as we would like because we are protecting taxpayers' money, and we all have our fiduciary relationships that we are bound to keep, but there is no excuse at this time when we have every American asking if we are going to pass NAFTA, if it should pass, will that have an effect on the number of jobs, in the United States. Some people think it will. Some people think it will not. I do not know.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, on NAFTA I would like to say that in the long term that policy may be the policy that is right for the United States 30 years from now. Our problem is the impact, in the short term, if there is a loss of jobs, particularly on the lower economic level and scale in this country. What are we going to do to assure those people that they will not be forgotten, and not forced into unemployment

and a state of welfare for the rest of their lives? What are we going to do for the people who are talking about welfare reform? Bring these people off welfare to do what? We do not have the jobs for them. Why are we talking about the retraining programs taking unemployed people and retraining them for what if we do not have the jobs?

The important thing, it seems to me, is the Government has to do something, and what I suggest, and this answers the gentleman from Wisconsin's question, is we do what Government does well:

We have the capacity to put this information in a uniform integrated data base. We have funded these technologies and their development over the last 30 years. Now we are going to turn to the private sector and say that government will only be involved to get that information to you. It will be the contract agent to handle the marketing, the commercialization and distribution by contract, to these new entrepreneurs and businesspeople and encourage them to go on and do one thing further that a government bureaucrat would not do if we created this as a government program. It is to the interest of that corporation, since it is a private profit-driven entity, to see that these businesses are successful. If there are important ingredients that can be given to those people running the businesses, it is going to be in the interest of that corporation to do the right thing and give them the technical assistance they really need rather than government technology assistance which in many instances does not comport with the needs of the business community.

□ 1400

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman again for indulging me and for yielding further.

The gentleman had mentioned, for example, that sometimes it takes decades for the government to get the right job done. You know the way I look at it is that in the world today we have this tremendous rapidity of change. Maybe government is no longer the answer. Maybe we have to ask completely different questions. Maybe what we need is less regulation, less government, smaller government. Maybe the only thing that government should do is protect our shores, deliver the mail, and stay the heck out of people's lives, and just let business and the people themselves find the solution to jobs. After all, the government really cannot create jobs.

I was interested yesterday, or the day before, in the Wall Street Journal they talked about health care. The gentleman mentioned health care. They had a huge maze, a diagram, of how the health care system is going to work. It is just unbelievable, the complexity and so on.

I think in the modern world we cannot have this type of complexity. Could it be that maybe the answer does not lie with the government and we should be scolding down government? Maybe we should be asking completely new questions in the era we are moving into. Maybe we are still asking questions of the old industrial age government, when we should be asking completely different questions, because the world has changed so much.

Mr. KANJORSKI. It is interesting, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is a Republican, me being a Democrat, that you should ask me that question. I will answer.

I happen to agree that government has its role because ultimately it is the final protector of what people need protection from, whether it is environmental protection, labor protection, abuses, poisons, things like that. We have a role there.

The problem that has been made in government, whether it has been during the last 12 years of the three Republican administrations or it will be made in this administration, is that we have to approach it from a new angle.

Actually, I would recommend that you and I compliment the President in coming up with a new panel to reform and reinvent government. I think that is the right attitude to take. I do not think we can suggest to the American people we are going to have less government. But I think we can suggest to the American people that rather than dealing with the bureaucracy as it presently exists, we can peel it down and we can look at problem solving. Our first question is what is the problem, and is there a solution, and not always think that government is the final arbiter of what that solution should be. On the other hand, we should make sure that we do not so deregulate and take out of control anything so that the private sector can abuse the system. Because today, regardless of how we like to think of it, there really is not a totally free enterprise system. It is a moderately free enterprise system. We have monopolies that exist by virtue of their size or the domination of their field or by virtue of the fact that they control the technology of the area they are in. If these people were to go unchecked, they could wreak great havoc on the marketplace and on the rights of all American citizens, if the government did not stand in a position to protect them.

Mr. ROTH. If the gentleman will yield further, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do not think the reinvention of government is the answer. I do not think that that is what the people are looking for. I think that the people are looking for less government.

Take a look at what is going on all over the world, whether it is in Japan, whether it is in Europe. Every country in the world seems to be downsizing, downscaling their government.

Mr. KANJORSKI. We are, too, Mr. ROTH.

Mr. ROTH. We are not downscaling government.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Under the proposals that the Vice President put forth, over the next 5 years we will cut down the employment of employees in the U.S. Government by a quarter of a million, 250,000 jobs. We are going toward deregulation of large areas. We are making government more user friendly.

Let me give you an example. Most recently the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. Ludwig, in approaching the financial institution business in providing for how they comply with the new truth-in-savings disclosure law for bank savings accounts, rather than having each bank go through three inches of regulations that were propounded to accomplish that end, what he did is he had it reduced to a computer program and provided that computer program at cost to every bank which wanted it. So if they followed the program he provided them, they would be in compliance with the regulations, and they would not have to hire the lawyers and other people to study the compliance requirements.

Mr. ROTH. Well, if the gentleman will permit me to say, you and I have been around this race track a couple of times, and you are not going to see in reinventing government less people on the Federal payroll. I think you are going to see more people.

I mean this in a friendly way. I think you are going to see more people. The people in government today feel government is the answer. I feel government is not the answer. I think that is really the big debate. You never get to the basic argument.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I think you brought out a good point. I want to respond to it, because I hear so many people on your side of the aisle make that proposal. When the Founding Fathers structured the American Constitution, the American Government, there were only 3.5 million people in the United States in 13 Colonies. Today we have 50 States and 250 million people. Every year the population of the United States grows.

If the employees of the U.S. Government were not to grow in number, in fact you would have a lessening of government every year, because the population grows at a rate of 4 or 5 percent a year.

I think this idea to always say the government is bigger this year than it was last year is really a misstatement of reality, because this year the population of the United States is larger than it was last year, and every year in history it has been so. So, invariably, the number of people involved will grow to some extent.

I am not talking about numbers. I am not as worried about how many

people we have doing things. What I am most worried about now is whether or not we have lost our vision as to applying the techniques that have already proved very successful in the American enterprise system.

It was proper that America make a major investment in research and development over the past 40 years. American Government, however, as currently structured is not the right tool to market that, contract for that, or give the assistance necessary to the private sector to use that research and development to create new jobs.

What I am saying is what our problem is, is we have trillions of dollars worth of new technology that is out there that is not being used. The answer to that problem will not come from government, because government does not understand how to market, does not have the incentive to market, does not have the success or failure attached to what you market successfully.

So we should turn to other agencies or an entity such as the free market system that have already had experience with and see how well it can function, and say, "Look, we in the government have made the investment in research and development. We now have these patents and licenses and processes. Let us turn them over to the free market system to put them out to the rest of the free market system, to develop and commercialize it."

Mr. ROTH. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the gentleman allowing me to participate in his time here in this debate. That is very generous of him. I want him to know I appreciate that. I know the gentleman feels very deeply about this, as I do, because we have served on the same committees in the past.

The reason I say our government is too big is because when you take food, shelter, and clothing, as published by one of the think tanks here in D.C. the other day, 40 percent of an average person's income goes to food, shelter, and clothing.

What is really surprising is that Federal, State, and local governments take 40 percent of his money in taxes. So the average person in America today is paying as much in taxes as they are in food, shelter, and clothing.

Mr. KANJORSKI. That figure is incorrect, if I may respond.

Mr. ROTH. It is correct. Let me just conclude by saying why is the government getting too big? We have a Department of Agriculture. We have some 2,000 agencies here on the Federal level. We have the Department of Agriculture, one I like very much, incidentally, because I have the third largest dairy district in the Nation.

But in 1900, we had some 3,000 people working in the Department of Agriculture, and we had millions of farmers. Today we have millions fewer

farmers, but do you know how many people we have working in the Department of Agriculture today? One hundred twenty-nine thousand. In 7 years, if we keep going in this direction, we will have more people working in the Department of Agriculture than we have single family farmers in America. That is why I say our government has gotten too big, way too big.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Let me take that as an example. If you listen to those raw figures and make that comparison, you could easily arrive at that conclusion. One, I would like to say when you say 40 percent of the average American's earning capacity goes to government, that is not correct. It is around 29 percent.

But, more importantly than that, we are next to last among the major industrial nations as to the amount of taxation the average worker pay toward the contribution of government at the Federal, State, and local area.

Now, let me address myself to your agriculture question, because I think it is very significant.

In 1850 in this country, unlike any other country in the world, including the Soviet Union just before its demise, it took one farmer to feed about 10 to 12 people. In the United States we took that ratio and needed a great number of farmers.

But we took the agriculture extension course. We took inventiveness and new technology. And through our land bank colleges out there, the agriculture colleges of America, we dispersed this information to the American farmer, to the point now where the American farmer feeds more than 100 citizens. Ten times as much productivity than the average farmer of the world.

□ 1410

It is because American Government, using the private sector to disperse research and development information and new technologies and new methodologies to the people that do the production in this country, and we did it very well, we actually have lost the need for a great number of farmers in America. But I think to make the blanket indictment of the failure of American agricultural policy over a period of 100 to 150 years would be the greatest mistake we could make.

Quite frankly, if we can take the experience of dispersing research and development and new technologies in the agricultural field and apply it to increase productivity in the manufacturing and industrial and communications sectors of the United States, that is what is going to build jobs and wealth in America. It is that very program. Do we defend or do we need all those Government employees? No.

I suggest our former colleague, who is now Secretary of Agriculture, is going about a hard effort to downsize

the Department of Agriculture. All I would say on that is, as we close some of those field offices, if I may, and I do not know if there are 1,200 or 12,000, but I hear the same thing in the back rooms of both parties here. I hear the complaints of the Members.

It is easy to stand here on the floor and say, let us cut expenditures. Let us cut departments. Let us cut Government. But then when you get your call from your local agriculture office and your farmer in your district, the membership seems to come on the floor and say something other than cut the number of Government employees.

You vote with me on closing those agricultural offices, and I will vote with you to close down some of the departments and agencies and downsize the Government. I think we will be working toward a common goal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I want to congratulate him for his very strong remarks in support of the free market process.

I would say, first, as he mentioned, the level of taxation that the American people face at the Federal, State, and local level juxtaposed to other industrialized nations, it seems to me that we need to realize that there is a marvelous byproduct of that. And it is, in fact, the fact that we have the highest standard of living of those industrial nations.

So there is a real benefit from the fact that we do not have a level of taxation which is higher than those other countries. I think, frankly, it should be lower, from my perspective.

Let me just take on this agricultural issue. I come from a State which has undergone a great deal of economic difficulty recently. We have suffered from cuts in the defense and aerospace industries.

The largest industry in my State of California happens to be agriculture. One of the great things about agriculture in California is that with few exceptions, agriculture in California, unlike other parts of the country, relies on exactly what my friend from Pennsylvania has been talking about; that is, the free market.

We have a lower level of Government subsidization of agricultural products in the largest State in the Union, which has as its largest industry the agriculture industry. And I think that is what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is referring to when he talks about the fact that there are more bureaucrats working at the Department of Agriculture than there are farmers in this country.

We need to recognize that bringing about a reduction there could be beneficial. I am not about to indict the entire agricultural system that is in this country. I recognize that there have

been many benefits. But it is important for us to note that in the largest State in the Union, where we have agriculture as our largest industry and a very low level of Government subsidization, we have a great deal of success. I would hope that the Federal Government could learn from that experience.

I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. KANJORSKI. In response I would say, I look forward to joining you, Mr. DREIER. I think you are eloquent in your argument, and I join the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] and I suggest also particularly in the area of water and dairy subsidies that the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Wisconsin will join me in cutting those subsidies, because the private sector should have more to do with where the production is or what the cost of water is, rather than some guarantee that the farmers of Wisconsin or the farmers of California or the farmers of Pennsylvania gain some guaranteed benefit or cushion.

What we have to do is start cutting them loose and putting them in the private enterprise system where they can be competitive.

I look forward to watching your votes, as I will cast mine, for cutting agriculture expenditures and subsidies, particularly excessive water and dairy subsidies.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman is correct. Our Government has gotten too big. That is exactly my argument.

But we have to do more than cut agriculture subsidies and other agencies. For example, the Department of Agriculture, in my opinion, does a much better job than most agencies. So we are using one. We could point to many, many others.

What I want to do is just distill this discussion we had here this afternoon down to one sentence. I think it is a fair summation.

Basically, what the gentleman on the other side of the aisle is saying is this, that America is great because Government programs are great. I am saying, America is great not because the Government is great. I am saying America is great because our people are industrious and because our people have a great deal of initiative.

America is great despite the Government programs, not because of the Government programs.

Mr. KANJORSKI. If I could respond, I hope no one that has listened to me, either yourself or anyone on C-SPAN, thinks that I am promoting further Government programs. What I am addressing is that I do not believe the Government is equipped to market or commercialize what patents and processes we have developed with our research and development to the private sector. What I am saying is, it is time that we in Government recognized that

we should turn to the private corporations as the agency to disperse that information broadly across the country, that we should turn to an American technology cable network program that can market that technology across the country and that, in fact, the Government be smart enough to do what it does well and it had done well, fund research and development. And now use the private sector, together with the Government getting its return on its investment back, by using the private sector to market and help commercialize the research and development owned by the United States of America that right now lies fallow in our vaults around the Federal Government.

If we market that, we have a key to create the million new jobs a year and the 12,000 small new businesses a year we need to restore economic prosperity. In doing so we will use new technologies to create wealth, to create good-paying jobs, high-paying jobs, to help solve the opposition that occurs in this country when the average American worker sees a threat to his job, like NAFTA, without an apparent interest on the Government's part to show where new jobs will be created for those who have lost their jobs as a result of the treaty.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for joining me on this.

Mr. Speaker, all I have to say is that in the next week we will be introducing into the Congress of the United States a bill which encompasses the four programs and processes that I have talked about today.

That is, the creation of a comprehensive database so that all the technologies, licenses, patents and processes owned or partially owned by the U.S. Government be centralized and standardized, be made user-friendly, and that we authorize the Secretary of Commerce to create and participate in the creation of a private corporation, driven by private market processes of profit and response and bottom-line consideration, to aggressively market in a multifaceted outreach program, including the use of the American technology network, to disperse the information of what we have to all of the American people so that they can become entrepreneurs or small businessmen and players in this system and, finally, that we authorize a technological transfer investment fund, to finance commercialization of these technologies and to help underwrite the entrepreneurial capital and venture capital necessary to start 12,000 new businesses a year, so that we can create a million new jobs a year.

What I am talking about is the creation every year of 25 new, million dollar capitalized, small businesses in every congressional district in the United States.

If we could accomplish that, if when NAFTA comes up, and if that should pass or fail, but if it passes, at least most Americans would know that their Congress and their President had put into place a program to create the thousands of jobs necessary to make up for the potential loss that may occur under NAFTA.

□ 1420

COMMENDATIONS TO JOHN HUME, LEADER OF THE SOCIAL DEMO- CRATIC LABOR PARTY IN NORTHERN IRELAND

(Mr. McCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Friends of Ireland, I rise today to commend John Hume, leader of the Social Democratic Labour Party in Northern Ireland, for his years of dedication to seeking peace in that troubled land.

John Hume has recently completed a series of discussions with Gerry Adams, leader of Sinn Féin, the political wing of the Irish Republican Army.

John Hume's express purpose in these talks was to end the violence in Northern Ireland and build a lasting permanent peace. Over the years, he has faced death threats and attacks from extremists, and his willingness to persevere in the cause of peace is testament to his courage, conviction, and ultimately his faith in humanity.

John Hume has recently briefed the Government of Ireland and I have included a copy of the Taoiseach's statement for the RECORD.

As leader of the Friends of Ireland, whose membership includes almost a quarter of the House of Representatives representing Irish-American constituencies of both Catholic and Protestant heritage, I know the Members of this body join me in praying for peace to come to Northern Ireland.

No lasting settlement can occur in Northern Ireland without the active involvement of both the Catholic and Protestant traditions and communities.

John Hume has taken a bold step in the service of peace. His character and dedication to nonviolence should be an inspiration to us all. I call upon the political leadership in Northern Ireland and the British and Irish Governments to continue to seek a lasting and just peace.

EMBASSY OF IRELAND,

Washington, DC, October 7, 1993.

JOINT STATEMENT BY THE TAOISEACH, MR. ALBERT REYNOLDS, T.D., AND THE TÁNAISTE, MR. DICK SPRING, T.D.

The Taoiseach, Mr. Albert Reynolds, T.D., and the Tánaiste, Mr. Dick Spring, T.D., this morning met the leader of the SDLP, Mr. John Hume, who briefed them on the position reached to date in his discussions with the leader of Sinn Féin, Mr. Gerry Adams.

The Taoiseach and the Tánaiste took the opportunity to express their deep appreciation of the work done by John Hume over the years in the cause of peace.

The Taoiseach and the Tánaiste believe that the highest political priority must be given to establishing a basis for a just and lasting peace and a permanent cessation of all violence. They will accordingly evaluate carefully the position conveyed to them, and consult with the Government, with a view to ensuring that it can make a very important contribution towards building a consensus for peace. It would be their intention to take full account of it, and decide how best to continue their efforts in their discussions with the British Government for the achievement of the objective of peace on this island.

By definition, this work will require much patient effort and preparation. The Government will not be elaborating in further detail for the moment. A period of reflection, assessment and discussion is now necessary, and the Government believe that in the interests of peace the need for confidentiality should be respected.

The ultimate goal of all parties committed to a peaceful approach must be to reach a lasting political settlement, which can only be achieved on the basis of the widest political dialogue and participation, with the consent of the people living in Ireland, both North and South.

JOB CREATION WITH THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREE- MENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out this time this afternoon to talk about an issue which continues to be hotly debated here in the Capitol and throughout the country. I am referring to the North American Free-Trade Agreement. I happen to feel very strongly that the North American Free-Trade Agreement is that one opportunity that we have to do exactly what my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] was talking about just a few minutes ago; that is, create jobs.

In fact, most projections are that we will create 200,000 jobs within the first 2 years. We will create a tremendous number of jobs in the automobile industry, as we will dramatically increase the flow of exports from the United States into Mexico overnight. In the first year we are anticipating, the big three auto makers, that is, a 60-fold increase in the level of exports to Mexico in automobiles, and that will create many job jobs right here in the United States.

I recognize that as this debate has gone on on the North American Free-Trade Agreement, there is a great deal of passion that is excluded by many of my colleagues, Ross Perot, people in organized labor, over the prospect of losing jobs. Everyone can feel very strongly about the threat of job loss. I can certainly relate to that.

The fact of the matter is, we need to recognize that over the past several

years, without a doubt, the one area of this economy that has created jobs has been in the export sector. We have been able to see those involved in the export sector gain a wage rate which is 17 percent higher than the wage rates that are there for people working in the nonexport sector.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to realize that if this House, which on November 17 will be casting a vote on the North American Free-Trade Agreement, chooses to say no to NAFTA, what happens is we will lose a tremendous number of jobs right here in the United States. Why? Because the tariff barrier which is so great today, preventing the flow of United States goods into Mexico, will be maintained and other countries, specifically Japan and countries in Western Europe, will seek to enter Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that the threat of losing jobs if we do not pass NAFTA is a very serious one. Think about the people today whose livelihoods depend on exports. There are thousands and thousands of people whose livelihoods depend on exports. In fact, 700,000 jobs here in the United States today depend on exports to Mexico alone.

There are many people who, as we have debated this issue, have said that flow of exports goes simply to the maquiladoras along the border. Yesterday our Labor Secretary, Mr. Reich, made it very clear. As high as 83 percent of the United States exports going to Mexico do not go to the maquiladoras, they go into Mexico as goods and services that are provided to the Mexican people.

As I listen to many of my colleagues decry the North American Free-Trade Agreement, it seems to me that we need to recognize that there are people who desperately want to defeat NAFTA. Mr. Speaker, the greatest opposition to NAFTA does not lie here in the United States, here in the Congress, among the American people. Mr. Speaker, the greatest opposition to the North American Free-Trade Agreement lies with the people in Japan and the people in Western Europe. I say that very simply, because if we defeat NAFTA, the people of Japan, who prevent us from selling our automobiles, and rice from my State of California, and other goods manufactured here in the United States, because of extraordinarily high tariffs and other barriers, want to be able to go to Mexico, utilize Mexico as an export platform so they can gain access to the tremendous 250 million consumers here in the United States.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we need to recognize that with NAFTA the rule of origin requirements will not allow the Western Europeans or the Japanese to utilize Mexico as an export platform. In fact, as Lee Iacocca, who is strongly supporting the North American Free-Trade Agreement, has said,

the corks on the champagne bottles will be popping in Japan and Germany if the United States Congress defeats NAFTA.

I simply underscore that it is essential for us to realize that the most virulent opposition to the North American Free-Trade Agreement lies in the countries that did not allow us to sell our goods and services into their countries without a large tariff barrier.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH], who has been working diligently on behalf of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I also thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief. The gentleman has brought up a key point, which is who gains and who loses should there be no NAFTA. What many people have failed to recognize is that the North American Free-Trade Agreement gives American workers, American businesses, better access to the Mexican market. It gives us preferential access to the American market, essentially tariff-free.

As we have discussed other times, what we have now is essentially one-way free trade. United States tariffs are so low they present no barriers to Mexican goods coming up here, effectively. They are about 2 percent, 3 percent, sometimes even lower in particular sectors.

Mexican tariffs, on the other hand, are relatively significant, 2½ times the average United States tariff. Those tariffs will remain in effect for Japanese exports, for West German exports, for French exports, but they will come down for American exports.

The Mexican market is one of the fastest growing in the world. It is certainly one of the fastest growing in North America, as well. It is not enough for opponents to really rely on history, to look at where the growth had come from in the past. I think it is far more important that we look to the future and see where the growth will be in the future, where will the jobs of tomorrow come from, not the jobs of yesterday.

The jobs of tomorrow will be generally export jobs, and export to the most rapidly growing economies, those of the rapidly developing countries. The Mexican market is more or less closed to us now. It has been opened slightly with the 1987 economic reforms, but there are still significant barriers to our businesses selling their products in Mexico.

Bringing down those barriers locks in preferential access to that market for our producers, for our workers. It brings us access to where the jobs are going to come from in the future, the rest of this decade and the 21st century.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for his contribution. Let me just say briefly, to be specific on some of those, I was mentioning earlier the automobile industry. Right now there is a 20-percent tariff on United States-made automobiles that are being exported to Mexico, creating a situation which allows us to sell no more than 1,000 automobiles a year, United States-made, into the Mexican market.

□ 1430

Mr. COPPERSMITH. That is fewer cars than we sell to Japan where the market is essentially closed to United States manufacturers. That is the effect of that 20 percent tariff right now.

On the other hand, the Mexicans have no problem or difficulty exporting cars made in Mexico back to the United States, because our tariff is so low.

Mr. DREIER. Exactly, a 2.2-percent tariff. And basically, as we look at this, the 20-percent tariff which they have today on our automobiles going in will drop down to zero as the 2.2-percent tariff that we have on theirs comes down to zero. The important thing that my friend has just said is that that 20-percent tariff remains for German and Japanese automobiles seeking to enter the Mexican market. And so what that says again is that there is a tremendous boost given to the American worker who has jobs today because of exports, and will continue to create more jobs in the area of exports in the future with the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

You know, we so often hear that the poor Mexican people cannot afford to buy any goods made in the United States because they have such a substandard of living. People who say this are looking at the Mexico of 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60 years ago. If you look at the growing middle-income wage earner in Mexico, it is one of the most dynamically growing middle classes in the world. And as we look at that, it is important for us to recognize there are 20 million people in Mexico who fall within that middle-income category, many of whom desperately want to have the chance to purchase United States-manufactured goods and services.

Let us look at the telecommunications industry, which has been a big and growing one there. We have all heralded the decision made by President Salinas a few years ago to privatize the telephone industry and the banking industry. We know companies like AT&T and others will benefit greatly. Why? Because of the exports of technologically advanced materials that have been developed right here in the United States to Mexico. Today, once again a tariff just like automobiles, 20 percent, and that tariff under NAFTA will go down to zero. And yet the tariff for Japanese telecommunications items and German telecommunications items will remain at 20 percent, meaning that

the United States worker will have a great preferential treatment over the Japanese or the German worker as we look at this issue.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Let me follow with two examples that are quite important to me and to my district, semiconductors and computers.

Right now the Mexican tariff on semiconductors is about 10 percent. The tariff on computers, where the semiconductors are largely used, is 20 percent. That tariff comes down to zero and gives our producers who are making those products preferential access to the rapidly growing Mexican market.

It is important, and there are many other examples, automobiles, semiconductors, computers, any other that we care to choose.

We had a discussion here last week where the debate was if NAFTA was a business deal, would you sign on to it. That is a business deal where really in effect we give up so little. We already have extremely low tariffs. Our tariff averages 2.2 percent for most of these products. They are extremely low. We have already given the Mexicans one-way free trade into the United States. We have already created a system where we risk losing jobs to the maquiladoras that essentially could be operated as export platforms. We already have environmental problems along the border because the Mexican infrastructure cannot keep up with the growth and with the environmental problems created by the maquiladoras, and where there are immigration pressures because people look for increased opportunities, whether it is along the borders at the maquiladora plants or in the United States.

We give up so little. We give up our problems. We give up extremely low tariffs. We give up a system of one-way free trade, and in exchange we get access to one of the fastest growing economies in the world.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for once again talking about what I call the Sam Gibbons thesis of one-way free trade. Every time the distinguished chairman of the Trade Subcommittee stands up and talks about Mexico, he refers to the fact that for decades we have had one-way free trade with Mexico. They have had access to our markets, and yet we have not had access to theirs because of tariff barriers that exist. And it seems to me that as we look at our goals here, they clearly are to try and bring about a balance. We hear that things are inequitable, but the fact of the matter is the inequity lies on the American worker who today cannot produce goods that can be sold in Mexico without a tax. It is a tax on American workers, and American goods that are seeking to enter the consumer market in Mexico, which clearly is growing. In fact, the anticipation is that we will see a 15-percent

growth in the consumer market in Mexico. It is today the 13th largest economy in the world, and the 10th largest consumer base there.

So while we get preferential access under NAFTA, the Japanese and the Germans do not. They still have those very high punitive tariffs on them. It stands to reason that this is a major victory, a major job creator, a major opportunity creator for the United States of America.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. I think the gentleman has raised a couple points that I want to follow on. One is that our competitors, our economic competitors, the ones from whom we have the most to fear, and the ones who really are competing with us for access to these markets, are the Japanese and the Europeans. And let us look at what they are doing. They are forming trading blocs. They are trying to form common markets or trading blocs as large as possible that give their industry and their workers and their service industries and their manufacturers preferential access within the trading bloc, to give themselves as large a base as possible. They have done that in Western Europe and the Japanese are seeking to do it in Asia. But when we try and do it in North America, to try and give our people preferential access to rapidly growing markets that naturally want to buy our products, it is hard to imagine, if you have not spent significant time overseas, how desirable American products are, and how much they want to buy them. We are somehow drawing back from that.

The second point is that it is really worse than just one-way free trade. The fact that anything Mexico makes can come in here with essentially no duty, but we are blocked from their market, it is worse than that, because I think the example the gentleman gave me was Tandy Corp. and IBM, and we are countenancing a system that actively gives American manufacturers an incentive to locate in Mexico, because from Mexico they can serve both the U.S. market with extremely low tariffs, as well as also the Mexican market which is closed to American exports. We are forcing people to move so that they can get access to a rapidly growing market under the current system.

NAFTA, by lowering the tariffs, removes that incentive. You will be able to serve the Mexican market with no tariff from the United States.

Mr. DREIER. My friend makes a very good point which deserves to be understood here. We so often hear from our constituents who say gosh, we should not pass NAFTA. What about all of those U.S. businesses that are fleeing to Mexico today. And we like to underscore, my friend and I, that that is without NAFTA. NAFTA is the best way to counter this. Why? Because contrary to the view that is out there,

United States businesses locate in Mexico to take advantage of cheap labor so they can sell back to the United States, that is wrong. Seventy percent, let me say that again, 70 percent of the business that United States-owned companies that locate in Mexico do, is in the Mexican market, because as my friend from Phoenix has said, it is the only way that they can gain access to the Mexican consumer market without going through these huge tariff barriers. So when the tariff barriers come down, the incentive for United States businesses to move from the United States to Mexico will be eliminated.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. As the gentleman from Claremont has pointed out, if low wages were everything, then Haiti, and Bangladesh, and Burkina Faso would be getting all of the jobs. They clearly are not. There is more to this than just the absolute level of wages that is going on here, and it has to do with productivity, it has to do with access to markets, it has to do with many other factors. Wages alone are not determinative.

But even more so, the people who use the current status quo as an argument for saying look at these jobs moving to Mexico, you are right, because so many of those points are moving to access the rapidly growing Mexican market because that is where the growth is coming from in the future. But moreover, opposing NAFTA is defending the status quo. It is preserving the system that has given us this kind of job movement, that has created this one-way free trade, that has allowed these environmental problems to fester. And it keeps the economic stimulus for immigration high. The only way we can deal with those problems that the current situation has, that is the status quo and that will continue to get worse, is to change the way the United States and Mexican markets relate to each other by giving us two-way free market, by letting United States workers get preferential access to the rapidly growing Mexican market.

Mr. DREIER. My friend's distinguished tenure in the Foreign Service has obviously come out in his ability to spot different low-wage markets, low-wage spots throughout the globe.

Let me talk further if I could for just a moment about the opponents to NAFTA. As I said, there is no one more virulently opposed to the North American Free-Trade Agreement than the Japanese and the Germans. Why? Because they are not treated as well as the Americans, and I happen to think that is just fine, with the implementation of NAFTA.

But there is a cadre of people here in the United States who have opposed NAFTA. And interestingly enough, of the Big Five opponents to NAFTA, all of them have run for President of the United States, and all of them have been resoundingly defeated.

□ 1440

Now, when we hear the argument about "not this NAFTA, we want to bring about a different North American Free-Trade Agreement," I often say, "Yes, let us put together a North American Free-Trade Agreement that would have the support of these five people who are opposed to the North American Free-Trade Agreement." Of those five, let me see, I will name them for you: Pat Buchanan, Jesse Jackson, Ross Perot, Jerry Brown, and Ralph Nader. Those five people have run for President of the United States. Those five people join the Japanese and the Germans as opponents to the North American Free-Trade Agreement. It is an amazing blend of people who look at the world much differently but who have come together to defeat the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and it is clear that they are wrong.

Why is it that these people would join with the Japanese and the Germans in opposing the North American Free-Trade Agreement? It stuns me.

When you look at those who are supporters of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, all living former Presidents of the United States. All living former Presidents of the United States strongly support NAFTA.

Now we hear about all this money that has bought out support for NAFTA, bought off Members of Congress, bought off all these people. I point to former Presidents of the United States Jimmy Carter, Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, George Bush, Gerald Ford. These people are interested in the future of the country that they had the opportunity to lead. Democrat and Republican alike, they have come together and joined with President Clinton in support of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

I am a Republican and proud of it. I happen to disagree with President Clinton on most every issue, but I believe he is right when he has joined with all of the living former Presidents, who strongly support this agreement. So we have people who have actually served as Commander in Chief who support NAFTA. We have five former Presidents against five people who sought that opportunity: Ross Perot, Jesse Jackson, Jerry Brown, my former Governor in California, Pat Buchanan, and Ralph Nader, right down the line. These are people who oppose NAFTA.

I choose to support those who are recognizing from experience that they had as Commander in Chief that breaking down barriers is the wave of the future.

Now, my friend from Phoenix has referred to the fact that he cannot understand why people would not want us to have the opportunity for U.S. workers to take advantage of that, and he is right. People who oppose it are not recognizing that during the decade of the

1980's we have had a technological explosion which brought down the Berlin Wall, allowed satellite technology, cellular telephones, fax machines; all these technological advances to improve the standard of living and the quality of life for peoples throughout the world. We want to expand that by now reducing tariff barriers so that we can recognize that trade is not a zero-sum game. There are winners in the trade game. No one has to lose.

Mr. Speaker, I further yield to my friend.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. The gentleman mentioned that the five opponents, he said the fact that they shared in common was that they were unsuccessful candidates for President. I think it is also important that we know what they also share, that is that in this case they are defenders of the status quo, defenders of a system of one-way free trade, where Mexican products come here essentially unhampered and our products are more or less blocked from the Mexican market.

So they are also defenders of the problems that we have today that are essentially getting worse. The maquiladora problem that essentially can be used as an export platform, the environmental problems along the border, the immigration pressures and economic pressures leading to people moving from Mexico to the United States; all those problems are problems we face today under the current system. They will continue to get worse unless we change them, unless we get the courage to change. The gentleman said he was willing to stand with every living ex-President, as am I. I am also willing to stand with the ingenuity and productivity and the American work ethic of the American work force. I think we can compete with anyone, we can compete on any fair terms in the world. We are having problems now because we have an unfair tariff in Mexico. By reducing that to zero, you will just see how well the American worker will do.

Mr. DREIER. My friend is absolutely right. I think it is important to point out to supporters of the North American Free-Trade Agreement: Today we were all intrigued and pleased to hear that the Nobel Peace Prize is jointly being extended to Nelson Mandela and F.W. de Klerk of South Africa as they seek to bring about an end to apartheid, and freedom and opportunity for the people of South Africa. The world has recognized that while there are still problems there, the peace prize was given to them.

As we look at this trade issue, I think we should point to the fact that every single living winner of the Nobel Laureate for Economics strongly supports the North American Free-Trade Agreement. In fact, there are 12 of them, including Kenneth J. Arrow, James Buchanan, Gerard Debreu, Mil-

ton Friedman, Wassily Leontief, Merton Miller, Franco Modigliani, Paul A. Samuelson, Theodore W. Schultz, William F. Sharpe, Robert Solow, and James Tobin.

They have joined with 264 other economists who have strongly urged support, and one of the lines in the letter that they sent to President Clinton says, "Specifically, the assertions that NAFTA will spur an exodus of U.S. jobs to Mexico are without basis." I think that while yesterday the Harvard economist who happens to be our Secretary of Labor, Robert Reich, said that an economist is someone who did not have the personality to become an accountant, points to the fact that clearly economists are not always the most heralded around. But we need to recognize 264 of them joining with those Nobel Laureates in economics, we need to recognize that these people have closely looked at markets and the fact that the United States will gain in the area of job opportunities, and those people join with the former Presidents in strong support of it, against the AFL-CIO who join with Ralph Nader, Pat Buchanan, Ross Perot, Jesse Jackson, Jerry Brown, the gang of opponents who really are sticking their heads in the sand. As my friend says, they are trying to maintain the status quo which jeopardizes jobs right here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I further yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. The gentleman is right. I think the important thing in this debate is we look forward to where the jobs are coming from in the future. No one has done more to articulate that problem and point the way to solution than the Secretary of Labor, Robert Reich, who is a fervent supporter of the free trade agreement, even though, following his hip surgery replacement in December, it is not clear that he passes the domestic content rule.

So this may be an admission against interests, but I think it is important that my colleague from Claremont is standing here trying to convince our colleagues of the importance of the free trade agreement because there may be some on his side of the aisle who are unwilling to do the right thing simply because this is an initiative and a priority of this administration. That is the task that the gentleman has to carry.

I, in turn, on my side of the aisle, have to carry, to convince fellow Members to support our Nation's President because he is exactly right. It is not enough we look back to the past, that we lock ourselves into the problems that we have, that we eliminate the opportunity for continuing growth, for where the growth has come from, as the gentleman pointed out, is from exports. It is important that we focus on what is in the best interest of our Na-

tion's future, not that may recapture a past that can never live again. Where the jobs are coming from, where the growth is coming from is clearly an expanded free trade, and if we just lower the barriers and let the American workers compete on an even basis and end this system of one-way free trade, I know we will grow and I know we will prevail.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for that very helpful contribution.

I would like to close by simply saying that while there is this view that the passion is on the other side, the fear of losing jobs, I know that my friend joins me in being very concerned about the prospect of job loss if NAFTA is not passed.

That is why I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support the North American Free-Trade Agreement, look at the details, look at the fact that we will lose jobs in the United States without the North American Free-Trade Agreement and that with the North American Free-Trade Agreement there is no doubt whatsoever that opportunity is going to be created for the American workers and for us to improve the standard of living on both sides of the border.

I hope very much that as November 17 approaches, that we will be able to prevail and provide what I think is the single most important job-creating vote that we will face in the 103d Congress.

□ 1450

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2520

Mr. YATES submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 103-299)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2520) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 7, 8, 20, 21, 25, 29, 37, 40, 45, 48, 56, 60, 61, 63, 79, 83, 86, 92, 103, 104, 112, 119, 122.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 28, 31, 34, 36, 57, 58, 59, 64, 68, 70, 80, 91, 93, 96, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 113, 114, 115, 116, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 4, 10, 12, 18, 23, 24, 27, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 49, 50, 51, 54, 62, 67, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 81, 82, 84, 90, 95, 100, 101, 102, 111, 118, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125.

Amendment numbered 3:
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Amendment numbered 99:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$296,982,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the first section number named in said amendment, insert: 313; and the Senate agree to the same.

SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOHN P. MURTHA,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
TOM BEVILL,
DAVID E. SKAGGS,
RONALD D. COLEMAN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
RALPH REGULA,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
JIM KOLBE

(except for amendments Nos. 16, 17, 18, and 123),

RON PACKARD
(except for amendments Nos. 16, 17, 18, and 123),

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,
DENNIS DECONCINI,
DALE BUMPERS,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
HARRY REID,
PATTY MURRAY,
DON NICKLES,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
MARK O. HATFIELD,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2520), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The conference agreement on H.R. 2520 incorporates some of the provisions of both the House and the Senate versions of the bill. Report language and allocations set forth in either House Report 103-158 or Senate Report 103-114 which are not changed by the conference are approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not negate the language referenced above unless expressly provided herein.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Amendment No. 1: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of

the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau of Land Management, \$599,860,000, of which the following amounts shall remain available until expended: \$1,462,000 to be derived from the special receipt account established by section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i)), and \$69,418,000 for the Automated Land and Mineral Record System Project: Provided, That appropriations herein made shall be not available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses and burros in the care of the Bureau of Land Management or its contractors; and in addition, \$15,300,000 for Mining Law Administration program operations to remain available through September 30, 1994, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau of Land Management and credited to this appropriation from annual mining claim fees so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$599,860,000: Provided further, That in addition to funds otherwise available, not to exceed \$5,000,000 from annual mining claims fees shall be credited to this account for the costs of administering the mining claim fee program, and shall remain available until expended.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment appropriates \$599,860,000 for management of lands and resources instead of \$604,415,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House did not include funds for this account. The amendment also derives \$15,300,000 for mining law administration and \$5,000,000 for the administration of the mining claim fee program from mining claim fees, and prohibits the destruction of healthy wild horses and burros as proposed by the Senate.

The decrease from the amount proposed by the Senate consists of \$250,000 for oil and gas in energy and minerals development; \$55,000 for preparation of land for disposal and sale in Oregon, \$400,000 for land withdrawal reviews, and \$1,000,000 for land exchanges, all in lands and realty management; \$300,000 for the Rio Puerco watershed, NM, in soil, water, and air management; \$300,000 for riparian management, \$500,000 for threatened and endangered species habitat management, and \$750,000 for general habitat management, all in wildlife habitat management; \$50,000 for the Chacoan Outliers in cultural resources management; \$50,000 for the bicycle trail between Glendale and Powers, OR, and \$400,000 for general management activities, both in recreation resources management; and \$500,000 for facilities maintenance.

The managers agree that \$55,000 is available within funds for lands and realty management to allow the BLM to prepare for the disposal and sale of 1,500 acres of BLM-administered lands in order to compensate for the loss of local county tax revenues which results from the acquisition of the Wood River Ranch in the Klamath Basin, OR.

FIRE PROTECTION

The managers agree that within funds provided for Bureau of Indian Affairs

presuppression activities \$300,000 is to complete the fire fuel break project around Glenallen, AK.

CONSTRUCTION AND ACCESS

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Retain the matter proposed by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: \$10,467,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment appropriates \$10,467,000 for construction and access instead of \$10,817,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House made no such appropriation. The reduction below the amount proposed by the Senate consists of \$250,000 for a low-water crossing below Pathfinder Dam., WY; and \$100,000 for interpretation and visitor facilities at Forts Craig and Cummings, NM.

LAND ACQUISITION

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$12,122,000 for land acquisition instead of \$14,877,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,177,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The management agrees to the following distribution of funds:

Book Cliffs, UT	\$245,000
Cache Creek, CA	700,000
Central Valley Wetlands, CA	900,000
Cowiche Canyon Preserve, WA	400,000
Desert Tortoise Habitat	700,000
Garden Park Fossil Area, CO	500,000
Idaho Lands	1,450,000
McIntire Spring, CO	550,000
Morongo Canyons, CA	200,000
Pechanga Burial Grounds, CA	300,000
San Pedro NCA, AZ	1,000,000
Santa Rosas Mountains, CA	1,000,000
West Eugene Wetlands, OR	750,000
Wood River, OR	1,400,000
Inholdings	750,000
Acquisition Management ..	1,277,000

Total, Bureau of Land Management 12,122,000

The managers acknowledge that Uintah County, Utah, has established a policy of no net gain of Federal land and no net loss of private property within the county, as a means to ensure a stable and secure tax base. Therefore, the funds to be used to complete acquisition of the Cripple Cowboy Ranch in the Book Cliffs/Bitter Creek, UT area cannot be expended until the Bureau of Land Management (1) identifies a list of specific Federal acreage located throughout Uintah County, which is equal in value and equal in amount to the acreage involved with the full acquisition of the Cripple Cowboy Ranch, that will be exchanged to the county in a diligent and timely manner, and (2) has consulted with the Uintah County Commission.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

The managers agree that the Bureau of Land Management may reprogram funds within this account for watershed assessment and restoration, up to a maximum of \$17,300,000. Within 60 days of enactment, the Department shall report to the Committees on Appropriations as to which programs were decreased to provide the watershed funds.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and improvement of Federal range-lands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 per centum of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315 et seq.) and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees and mineral leasing receipts from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior pursuant to law, but not less than \$10,025,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed \$600,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

For administrative expenses and other costs related to processing application documents and other authorizations for use and disposal of public lands and resources, for costs of providing copies of official public land documents, for monitoring construction, operation, and termination of facilities in conjunction with use authorizations, and for rehabilitation of damaged property, such amounts as may be collected under sections 209(b), 304(a), 304(b), 305(a), and 504(g) of the Act approved October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), and sections 101 and 203 of Public Law 93-153, to be immediately available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary of section 305(a) of the Act of October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1735(a)), any moneys that have been or will be received pursuant to that section, whether as a result of forfeiture, compromise, or settlement, if not appropriate for refund pursuant to section 305(c) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1735(c)), shall be available and may be expended under the authority of this or subsequent appropriations Acts by the Secretary to improve, protect, or rehabilitate any public lands administered through the Bureau of Land Management which have been damaged by the action of a resource developer, purchaser, permittee, or any unauthorized person, without regard to whether all moneys collected from each such forfeiture, compromise, or settlement are used on the exact lands damage to which led to the forfeiture, compromise, or settlement: Provided further, That such moneys are in excess of amounts needed to repair damage to the exact land for which collected.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

In addition to amounts authorized to be expended under existing law, there is hereby appropriated such amounts as may be contributed under section 307 of the Act of October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), and such amounts as may be advanced for administrative costs, surveys, appraisals, and costs of making conveyances of omitted lands under section 211(b) of that Act, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures, and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title; up to \$100,000 for payments, at the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau of Land Management; miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities author-

ized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate, not to exceed \$10,000: Provided, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Bureau may, under cooperative cost-sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly-produced publications for which the cooperators share the cost of printing either in cash or in services, and the Bureau determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment provides indefinite appropriations for range improvements; service charges, deposits, and forfeitures; and miscellaneous trust funds as proposed by the Senate. The House bill included no appropriations for these accounts.

The amendment also includes administrative provisions for the Bureau of Land Management as proposed by the Senate, amended to delete references to expenditures for Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands no longer required. The House had no similar provision.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$484,313,000 for resource management instead of \$492,229,000 as proposed by the House and \$476,831,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The net change to the House position includes the following:

Increases:

Bay estuary program coordination	\$75,000
Platte River studies	196,000
Middle Rio Grande Bosque project	200,000
Alaska accident prevention, safety and survival training	300,000
Nevada Negotiated Water Settlement Act	100,000
Alaska refuge operations (transfer from NBS)	665,000
Alaska subsistence harvest	\$250,000
Harvest information	250,000
Training	700,000
Philadelphia port of entry	100,000
Baltimore port of entry ..	200,000

Decreases:

Endangered species:	
Prelisting	250,000
Listing	250,000
Consultation	1,500,000
Recovery	2,125,009
Washington State ecosystems project	138,000
Chicago Wetlands Office	143,000
Bay estuary program:	
Puget Sound	69,000
San Francisco Bay	25,000
Long Island Sound/So. New England	100,000
Hydropower licensing/re-licensing	125,000
Environmental contaminants	500,000
National Wetlands Inventory	1,100,000
Challenge Cost Share	250,000
Air quality activities	250,000
Habitat Management	800,000
Refuge operations and maintenance	375,000
Water rights	250,000
Maintenance	500,000
RESERVA	150,000

North American Waterfowl Management Program Coordination	\$125,000
Fisheries stewardship	500,000
Interjurisdictional rivers	427,000
Space rental	1,000,000

The managers agree to the following:

1. Up to \$100,000 within habitat conservation is available for model wetlands restoration at The Wilds, Ohio.

2. \$400,000 is included within the recovery budget for Mexican wolf recovery programs.

3. The Service is to follow the guidance provided in House Report 103-158 regarding the innovative habitat conservation program in southern California.

4. None of the reduction for habitat management below the House level is specifically directed at Patuxent NWR, MD.

5. While \$665,000 has been transferred back to refuge operations in Alaska from the National Biological Survey, the Service should continue to coordinate with the NBS on those activities which have been conducted for several years by the Alaska Research Center.

The managers urge the Fish and Wildlife Service to complete its review of the regulations governing the release and harvest of captive-reared mallards on State licensed regulated shooting areas. The Service should review all data bases on this issue, including its current study on duck release programs as well as other studies in progress, and present its findings to the Committees on Appropriations and other interested parties before considering any changes in regulations.

The managers recognize the importance of the Treaty Indian Catch Monitoring Program and the essential role of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in providing technical assistance in support of this program for the collection and dissemination of Tribal commercial fisheries harvest data. The managers encourage the Service to do everything in its power to ensure the continued success of the Treaty Indian Catch Monitoring Program.

Amendment No. 6: Earmarks \$2,500,000 for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation as proposed by the House instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Deletes Senate provision earmarking \$100,000 for the purpose of compiling and maintaining a database consisting of big game and small game population levels and hunter harvests in, and adjacent to, areas under consideration for wolf reintroduction. While not specifying a certain dollar amount, the managers urge the Service to compile this data within available funds consistent with the objectives identified in the Senate bill language and, in particular, to make use of data already available and to cooperate with State efforts already underway to establish a comprehensive big game database.

Amendment No. 8: Deletes Senate earmark of \$40,000 for the research program relating to habitat and repopulation studies and possible interactions between wolves and mountain lions in and around Yellowstone National Park. This issue is addressed under the National Biological Survey.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$73,565,000 for construction instead of \$53,209,000 as proposed by the House and \$79,388,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers agree to the following distribution of funds:

Site	Description	Amount
Aransas NWR, TX	Office/residence replacement	\$294,000

Site	Description	Amount
Bear River MBR, UT	Flood damage repair	\$250,000
Bozeman Fish Tech Center, MT	Fish contaminant building	1,160,000
Cape Romain NWR, SC	Replacement visitor center	1,550,000
Chetah River, WA	River restoration	200,000
Crab Orchard NWR	Water tower rehabilitation	439,000
Eastern Shore of Virginia NWR, VA	Complete visitor center	1,000,000
Hatchie NWR, TN	Handicapped fishing access	500,000
Hawaii Captive Breeding Facility, HI	Endangered bird species	1,500,000
Hawaii Refuges, HI	Fencing	450,000
Kenai NWR, AK	Skilak Loop	2,000,000
Ketchikan Eco Services, AK	Replace dock facilities	1,350,000
Lake Ilo NWR, ND	Improve dam safety	9,280,000
Lower Truckee River, NV	Restore habitat	450,000
Makah NWR, WA	Road Rehabilitation	500,000
National Ed & Training Center, WV	Training Center	21,280,000
Noxubee NWR, MS	Plan bridge replacement	800,000
Ottawa NWR, OH	Metzger Marsh dike	1,800,000
Ouray NWR, UT	Endangered razorback sucker	970,000
	Pelican Lake Pipeline	714,000
		650,000
Pacific Institute of Natural Sciences, OR		
Pacific Island NWR, HI	Repair seawall	500,000
Panther Swamp NWR, MS	Replace 4 bridges	1,375,000
Prime Hook NWR, DE	Replace office/visitor center	342,000
Tensas NWR, LA	Access road	2,620,000
Togiak NWR, AK	Employee housing (3)	1,145,000
Trempealeau NWR, WI	Entrance road bridge	351,000
Upper Souris NWR, ND	High hazard dam	6,303,000
Walnut Creek NWR, IA	Refuge development	5,290,000
Wertheim NWR, NY	Building repairs	334,000
Wichita Mtns WR, OK	Gramma Lake Dam	560,000
	Complete facility	600,000
	Waste water treatment system	150,000
William Finley NWR, OR	Muddy Creek Bridge replacement	130,000
Emergency projects		1,000,000
Dam safety inspections		594,000
Bridge Inspections		579,000
Construction management		5,540,000
Offset	Lake Elmer Thomas dam	-985,000
Total		73,565,000

No funds have been provided to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the pollution abatement facility at the Winthrop National Fish Hatchery, WA because this facility has been transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The managers agree that the fiscal year 1994 appropriation ends the Federal contribution to the Pacific Institute of Natural Sciences.

The managers have provided an additional \$1.5 million to the Service for Phase I of the captive propagation facility for endangered species in Hawaii. Since the Service has stated that this project is a high priority, the managers expect the Service to include the funds needed for operation of this facility and Phase II construction in the fiscal year 1995 budget and beyond.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following:
of which \$1,800,000 shall be available as a grant from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to Ducks Unlimited, Inc., for construction of the Federal portion of the dike and pumping station at Metzger Marsh: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law a single procurement for the construction of facilities at the Walnut Creek National Wildlife Refuge, Iowa may be issued which includes the full scope of the project: Provided further, That the solicitation and the contract shall contain the clause "availability of funds" found at 48 CFR 52.323.18

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment restores House language stricken by the Senate regarding construction of a Metzger Marsh dike and pumping station at Ottawa NWR, OH and allows a sin-

gle procurement to go forward for construction at Walnut Creek NWR, IA.

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT AND RESTORATION FUND

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$6,700,000 for natural resource damage assessment instead of \$7,260,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,260,000 as proposed by the Senate.

LAND ACQUISITION

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which appropriates \$82,655,000 for land acquisition instead of \$61,610,000 as proposed by the House and \$76,204,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The managers agree to the following distribution:

ACE River Basin, SC	\$3,000,000
Alaska Peninsula NWR, AK	250,000
Alaska Refuges	3,000,000
Archie Carr NWR, FL	1,390,000
Back Bay NWR, VA	500,000
Balcones Canyonlands NWR, TX	3,000,000
Bald Knob NWR, AR	1,000,000
Bogue Chitto NWR, LA	500,000
Buenos Aires NWR, AZ	1,200,000
Cache River, AR	3,000,000
Canaan Valley NWR, WV	2,000,000
Cape May NWR, NJ	2,100,000
Chincoteague NWR, VA	500,000
Columbian Deer NWR, WA	500,000
Connecticut River NWR (planning)	500,000
Cypress Creek NWR, IL	3,000,000
E.B. Forsythe NWR, NJ	4,500,000
Emiquon NWR, NJ	1,430,000
Grand Bay NWR, MS, AL	500,000
Grasslands (Gallo Ranch), CA	2,100,000
Grays Harbor NWR, WA	1,000,000
Great Swamp NWR, NJ	500,000
Kilauea NWR, HI	2,175,000
Lake Wales Ridge NWR, FL	2,000,000
Lower Rio Grande Valley NWR, TX	2,360,000
Lower Suwannee NWR, FL	1,000,000
Marais de Cygnes, KS	400,000
Minnesota Valley NWR, MN	1,000,000
Pelican Island NWR, FL	1,220,000
Pettaquamscutt NWR, RI	750,000
Rachel Carson NWR, ME	2,000,000
Red Rock Lakes, MT	400,000
Sacramento River NWR, CA	3,000,000
San Francisco Bay NWR, CA	2,500,000
St. Marks NWR, FL	780,000
Sippewisset Marsh, MA	800,000
Stewart B. McKinney NWR, CT	1,600,000
Stone Lakes NWR, CA	1,000,000
Tensas NWR, LA	1,900,000
Trinity River NWR, TX	1,000,000
Tualatin NWR, OR	2,000,000
Two Ponds Wetlands, CO	1,800,000
Walkkill NWR, NJ	2,000,000
Inholdings	1,000,000
Acquisition management	8,500,000
Emergency/hardships	1,000,000
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	5,000,000
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	82,655,000

The managers agree that the \$500,000 recommended for the implementation of the Silvio O. Conte Refuge Act of 1990 in the Connecticut River Basin will be used primarily to complete the planning process. The Conte refuge represents an opportunity for a new kind of wildlife refuge, one that emphasizes building on existing efforts to protect the ecosystem and on cooperative agreements between State, local, Federal agencies, private landowners, and nonprofit foundations and citizen organizations. The Department of the Interior should interpret the Connecticut River in the context of the region's cultural, geological and ecological history with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service working in a coordinated fashion.

The appropriation for acquisition at E.B. Forsythe NWR, NJ is for tracts at Chestnut Neck, Reedy Creek, Stout Creek and Manahawkin in the Barnegat Expansion Area.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$9,000,000 for the cooperative endangered species conservation fund instead of \$9,571,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,571,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$12,000,000 for the National wildlife refuge fund instead of \$11,748,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,748,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$12,000,000 for the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund instead of \$11,257,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,257,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL BIOLOGICAL SURVEY

RESEARCH, INVENTORIES, AND SURVEYS

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$163,519,000 for research, inventories, and surveys instead of \$163,604,000 as proposed by the House and \$166,837,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The net change to the House position includes the following:

Increases:

Restoration of House general reduction (species biology)	\$600,000
Restoration of House general reduction (population dynamics)	600,000
Restoration of House general reduction (ecosystems)	2,500,000
Reno biodiversity initiative	1,500,000
Patuxent operations	400,000
Stuttgart, AR facility	90,000
Decreases:	
Genetics and systematics research	375,000
Endangered plant research	300,000
Population dynamics	300,000
Monitoring and inventory	500,000
Landscape functions	300,000
Large rivers	400,000
Southern forested wetlands	250,000
Ecological impacts of contaminants	250,000
Transfer to Bureau of Mines	400,000
Aquatic Gap Analysis	500,000

National Park Service inventories	\$500,000
Socioeconomics evaluation	500,000
Technical Support Center	200,000
Administration	1,000,000

The managers agree to the following:

1. Every effort should be made to keep administrative costs at a minimum. The managers do not want potential savings from consolidation of Department of the Interior research functions to be eroded by a significant growth in overhead positions; particularly important is to control the number of positions and dollars associated with Congressional and Public Affairs.

2. Money for a waterfowl survey in the Yukon-Kuskokwim NWR, AK and for Alaska marine mammal management is included within the amount provided as proposed in the budget and by the House. The managers expect the National Biological Survey to continue these activities in coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

3. The Survey is to allocate \$40,000 for the research program relating to habitat and reproduction studies and possible interactions between wolves and mountain lions in and around Yellowstone National Park.

The managers have agreed to retain the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory in Stuttgart, Arkansas, in the National Biological Survey. The managers are aware of concerns, however, that placing the Laboratory in the National Biological Survey may not be compatible with the Laboratory's legislative mandate under the Fish and Rice Rotation Act (P.L. 85-342). Because of this concern, the managers will reexamine at the end of 1994 whether the Laboratory should be located in the National Biological Survey or if the unique research mandate and mission of the Laboratory might be better served by moving the Laboratory to the Fish and Wildlife Service's Fishery Operations or to the Department of Agriculture.

Amendment No. 17: Earmarks \$162,092,000 to remain available until September 30, 1995 instead of \$162,177,000 as proposed by the House and \$155,410,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows: *Provided, That none of the funds under this head shall be used to conduct new surveys on private property unless specifically authorized in writing by the property owner*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The managers agree that funding for the National Biological Survey is provided only to the extent authorized by law and shall be used to continue ongoing research activities of the Department previously carried out by a variety of separate agencies within the Department. This provision is not intended to create or diminish any activity or power, whether express or implied. The funding is specifically limited in kind and scope to research and other activities expressly authorized by law.

While the managers support the goals outlined by the Secretary when he proposed creation of this new agency, i.e. to consolidate the collection and dissemination of biological information, concerns have been raised about the authorities of the new agency, particularly with respect to private property rights and the use of volunteers which

should rightly be addressed through the authorizing process which is currently ongoing. The managers encourage the appropriate authorizing committees to act promptly to clarify the mission and responsibilities of this new agency. Language is also included requiring written permission of the property owner before conducting any new surveys on private property.

The amendment also deletes Senate language regarding use of volunteers and acceptance of lands, buildings, or equipment from public and private sources.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$1,061,823,000 for operation of the National park system instead of \$1,059,033,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,063,335,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Changes to the Senate distribution of funds is as follows:

Increases:

Resource stewardship:	
Special focus/new parks	\$1,007,000
Work force	
professionalization ...	900,000
Prototype monitoring	100,000
System level research	100,000
Carlsbad Caverns NP,	
NM	150,000
Everglades NP, FL	500,000
San Francisco Maritime NHP, CA	350,000
Santa Monica Mountains NRA, CA	310,000
Visitor services:	
Big Bend NP, TX (airplane operations)	125,000
Guadalupe Mountains NP, TX	370,000
Chamizal NMEM, TX	132,000
Cuyahoga Valley NRA, OH	1,200,000
Allegheny Portage RR, PA	150,000
Ft. Necessity NB, PA ..	250,000
Johnstown Flood NMEM, PA	100,000
Fords Theatre	75,000
Special Focus/New Parks	136,000
Maintenance: Special focus/new parks	714,000
Park Support: Special focus/new parks	155,000
Decreases:	
Cultural resources cyclic maintenance	844,000
Regional cyclic maintenance	2,474,000
Regional repair and rehabilitation	2,906,000
Base increase (Park support)	600,000
Challenge Cost Share	1,000,000
Poverty Point NM, LA ..	212,000
Keweenaw NHP, MI	300,000

The managers agree that there is no specific earmark for the Santa Fe Trail within the increase for the National Trail System and there is no earmark for the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail.

Within the amounts provided are the following:

1. \$350,000 for trails at Big South Fork NRA, TN.
2. \$50,000 for picnic shelters at Bighorn Canyon NRA, WY, and
3. \$40,000 for the Sterling Munro nature trail at North Cascades, NP, WA.

The managers are aware of the National Park Service's decision to remove the under-

ground commercial concession operated facilities from the concessions contract at Carlsbad Caverns National Park. The managers encourage the Secretary to revisit this issue and to ensure that adequate opportunity will continue to be provided for public input on this decision. Among the factors that should be covered upon further review are: whether the lunchroom has a negative impact on the environmental integrity of the caverns, impact on the visitor experience, and consistency with 16 U.S.C. 20.

The managers agree to review funding for Keweenaw NHP, MI during consideration of the fiscal year 1995 appropriation.

Amendment No. 20: Strikes Senate language prohibiting the National Park Service from entering into concessionaire contracts that do not include a termination for cause clause. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 21: Deletes Senate provision which reallocates two natural resource management positions for wolf reintroduction to improvement of the physical infrastructure of Yellowstone NP.

The managers expect that Yellowstone National Park will receive fair consideration in the allocation of the increased funds provided for park operations in fiscal year 1994. In allocating these resources, the Park Service should address the need for balance between funds for natural resource protection and visitor services. Any increases provided for natural resource activities should be targeted towards the protection and preservation of the significant natural resources which draw so many visitors to the first established national park, and not be used for activities associated with wolf reintroduction. At the same time, the park should seek to maximize the provisions of the recently enacted Budget Reconciliation legislation related to funding for fee collection activities.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$42,585,000 for national recreation and preservation instead of \$35,606,000 as proposed by the House and \$43,844,000 as proposed by the Senate. The agreement also deletes the Senate earmark of \$610,000 for the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission. Deleting this language in no way reduces the amount available to the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission.

Changes to the House position include increases of \$250,000 for the National Center for Preservation Technology, \$300,000 for International Park Affairs, \$25,000 for the Maine Acadian Cultural Preservation Commission, \$750,000 for the Native Hawaiian culture and arts program, \$5,304,000 for the Wheeling National Heritage area, \$400,000 for Steel Heritage Industry technical assistance and a decrease of \$50,000 in grant administration.

The funding level includes \$5,304,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the Wheeling project. These funds are made available subject to the passage of authorizing legislation, however, in the event authorizing legislation is not enacted prior to March 30, 1994, these funds will become available at that time. In the interim period, the Park Service may provide technical assistance funds only for the Wheeling project.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 23: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which appropriates \$201,724,000 for construction instead of \$183,949,000 as proposed by the House and \$191,136,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The managers agree to the following distribution:

Acadia NP, ME	Restore carriage roads	1,327,000
Alaska Parks	Employee housing	5,433,000
Alaska Parks	Communication system	2,560,000
Allegheny Portage Railroad, PA	Lemon House Rehabilitation	1,930,000
Biscayne NP, FL	Equipment, exhibits, trails	3,355,000
Blackstone River Valley NHC	Massachusetts/Rhode Island	500,000
Blue Ridge Parkway, VA	Hare Mill Pond dam	450,000
Boston NHP, MA	Old South Meeting House	2,400,000
Boston NHP, MA	Dorchester Heights	700,000
Boston NHP, MA	U.S. Constitution Museum	1,900,000
Boston Public Library, MA	Rehabilitation	2,000,000
Chamizal NM, TX	Landscape, lighting	840,000
Chickamauga-Chattanooga NMP	Road relocation	3,600,000
Chickasaw NRA, OK	Campground rehabilitation	1,420,000
Colonial NHP, VA	Jones Mill Pond dam	1,000,000
Coulee Dam NRA, WA	Boat launch	416,000
Crater Lake National Park, OR	Campground expansion	150,000
Cuyahoga Valley NRA, OH	Kreji toxic waste cleanup	3,800,000
	Armington dam safety mods.	200,000
	Rehabilitate historic structures	1,000,000
	Railroad track and bridges	2,000,000
Delaware Water Gap NRA, PA	Raymondskill Falls Development	450,000
	Bushkill Access	1,300,000
	Trail Development	195,000
Denali NPP, AK	Mountain rescue center	1,487,000
	Teklinika restrooms	2,200,000
Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial, DC		11,000,000
Gateway NRA, NY	Great Kills Bathhouse	7,150,000
Gateway NRA, NY	Reis Park	5,200,000
Gettysburg NMP, PA	Technical assistance	100,000
Grand Canyon NP, AZ	Employee housing	6,447,000
Great Basin NP, NV	Water system	250,000
Harpers Ferry National Historic Park	Lower town	2,637,000
Hot Springs, AR	Flood Control	350,000
Ice Age Scientific Reserve, WI	Exhibits	500,000
Independence NHP, PA	Rehabilitate utility system	15,100,000
Indiana Dunes NL, IN	Long Lake Wetlands Overlook	125,000
James A. Garfield NHS, OH	Site, building restoration	1,311,000
Jean Lafitte NHP, LA	Various projects	925,000
John D. Rockefeller Parkway, WY	Relocate Flagg Ranch	700,000
Kalaupapa NHP, HI		525,000
Lackawanna Heritage Park, PA	Technical assistance	670,000
Lincoln Research Center, IL	Begin construction	3,000,000
Lincoln Home NHS, IL	Dubois House rehabilitation	709,000
LBJ Ranch NHS, TX	Exhibits	1,400,000
Martin Luther King, Jr. NHS, GA	Visitor facilities	9,982,000
Mount Rainier NP, WA	Paradise water/sewer system	1,230,000
Mount Vernon Bicycle Trail, VA	Correct safety hazards	250,000
Natchez Trace Parkway, MS	Parkway construction	4,000,000
Natchez NHP, MS	Melrose	702,000
National Capital Parks, DC	Renovate White House utilities	4,200,000
National Capital Parks, DC	Lincoln/Jefferson Memorials	5,318,000
National Center for preservation Technology, LA	Building Rehabilitation	3,350,000
New England Conservatory, MA	Jordan Hall	1,500,000
New River Gorge NR, WV		830,000
Northwest Alaska Parks	Interagency headquarters facility	1,684,000
Pacific Northwest Region	Rehabilitation projects	1,844,000
Penn Center	Rehabilitation	500,000
Port Chicago NM, CA	Memorial fabrication/construction	308,000
Salem Maritime NHS, MA	Various projects	2,120,000
Sequoia NP, CA	Replace Giant Forest facilities	6,825,000
Stones River NB, TN	Trail connector	700,000
Thomas Stone NHS, MD	Main House restoration	1,000,000
Ulysses S. Grant NHS, MO	Restore historic structures	150,000
Upper Delaware Scenic & Rec Area	Towpaths, trunkwalls	1,310,000
Upper Susquehanna Heritage, PA	Technical assistance	50,000
War in the Pacific, GU	Monument	500,000
Weir Farm NHS, CT	Rebuild historic structures	395,000
Yosemite NP, CA	Maintenance/warehouse	4,890,000
Yosemite NP, CA	Employee housing	7,595,000
Emergency and Unscheduled Housing rehabilitation		2,000,000
Planning		12,000,000
General Management Plans		28,000,000
Special resource studies		6,600,000
Strategic Planning Office		1,200,000
Offsets		400,000
		-10,321,000
Total		201,724,000

For general management plans, the managers have provided \$800,000 for the Presidio, CA as requested, \$125,000 for Weir Farms NHS, CT, \$100,000 for Organ Pipe NM, AZ, \$80,000 for Brown v. Board of Education, KS, \$81,000 for Great Egg Harbor, NJ, and \$107,000 for Stones River NB, TN.

In the category special resources studies, the managers expect the following studies to be carried out: Southwestern Camino Real and Colonial Missions, TX, NM, Golden Gate NRA (Pacifica), Hudson Valley Greenway, Rutherford B. Hayes, Virginia City, MT, Atchafalaya Basin, LA, Underground Railroad, Route 66 and Cedar Valley. No Specific dollar amount is assigned to any one special resource study in this list. Priority should be given to completion of ongoing studies before initiating new studies proposed in the budget and not identified herein. Where the House and Senate have identified the same amount for a study, the conference agreement includes the amount as provided by both Houses.

Within the planning amount, the managers agree to:

Boston NHP, MA	\$315,000
Crater Lake NP, OR	1,200,000
Glacier NP, MT (Chalet)	400,000
Jean Lafitte NPP, LA (Barataria levee)	100,000
Zion NP, UT (transportation plan)	360,000
Olympic NP, WA (Elwha dam)	2,800,000
Buffalo River, AR (boundary study)	200,000
Fort Necessity NB, PA	775,000
James A. Garfield NHS, OH	210,000
Thomas Stone NHS, MD	150,000
Cuyahoga Valley NRA, OH	515,000
San Antonio Missions NHP, TX (exhibits)	30,000

Within the money set aside for emergencies, \$300,000 is for emergency repairs at the Glacier NP, MT chalets.

The managers are concerned about cost estimates in excess of \$150,000,000 related to the removal of the Elwha dam. The Department of the Interior is urged to look at the ultimate benefits from removal of the dam to determine whether the money spent removing the dam would result in a better return for natural systems that spending the same amount of money on other natural resource restoration projects.

The managers understand that a land acquisition program for the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park is currently underway, and that the Park's visitor center is scheduled to be completed in July 1995. The managers urge the National Park Service to request funding for exhibits and media production at the Visitor Center as part of its fiscal year 1995 budget request.

The offset of \$10,321,000 includes \$4,100,000 from the Denali NP, AK hotel, \$4,377,000 from the Keith Albee Theater restoration and \$1,844,000 from A Walk on the Mountain.

The amount provided for Salem Maritime NHS, MA includes the following:

Central wharf site improvements	\$1,360,000
St. Joseph's Polish Club rehabilitation	250,000
Armory visitor center audio visual equipment	235,000
Education programs outreach	75,000
Project administration/archeology	125,000
Technical assistance	75,000
Total	2,120,000

The managers are aware of a commitment by the Lassen Volcanic National Foundation to provide a 50% match of Federal funds for a visitors center at Lassen Volcanic National Park and will give every consideration to providing the Federal share in fiscal year 1995.

The managers request that the Park Service give consideration to the visitor facility needs at Fort Necessity NB, PA in the development of the fiscal year 1995 budget request.

The construction program of the National Park Service is of particular concern. Cost estimates continue to be unreliable. Projects seem to develop and expand with no thought given to the budget climate or their relationship to the overall mission within the National Park system. The priority system for rating park development projects is undecipherable and of no use to decisionmakers in weighing the merits of one project against another. The National Park Service needs to reconfigure its priority system so that more objective criteria are used and the overall needs of the system are taken into account. Further, while the managers appreciate the Park Service's commitment to high quality standards, these standards must be maintained within realistic fiscal constraints. The Park Service must begin looking at construction projects as we would our own budgets, i.e. is there a lower cost alternative that will serve the mission of the agency as well as the individual park unit. This issue is also addressed in Amendment No. 55.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: \$4,377,000 to be derived from amounts made available under this head in Public Law 1201-512 as a grant for the restoration of the Keith Albee Theatre in Huntington, West Virginia, and \$1,844,000 to be derived from amounts made available under this head in Public Law 102-381 for a pedestrian walkway and interpretive park (A Walk on the Mountain): Provided, That \$2,000,000 for the Boston Public Library and \$500,000 for the Penn Center shall be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470a: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed \$350,000 shall be made available to the City of Hot Springs, Arkansas, to be used as part of the non-Federal share of a cost-shared feasibility study of flood protection for the downtown area which contains a significant amount of National Park Service property and improvements: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law a single procurement for the construction of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial may be issued which includes the full scope of the project: Provided further, That the solicitation and the contract shall contain the clause "availability of funds" found at 48 CFR 52.323.18: Provided further, That for the purpose of performing an environmental impact statement (EIS) on the Paseo del Norte alignment, the National Park Service's proposed Calabacillas alternative road alignment, and any other alternative routes in association with the Petroglyph National Monument in Albuquerque, New Mexico \$400,000 are to be allocated to the City of Albuquerque to perform the EIS, only in the event that the City of Albuquerque and the National Park Service reach

mutual agreement, within 75 days of the date of enactment of this Act, on the conditions that must be met for the study, such funds to be derived by transfer from balances available in the "Land acquisition and State assistance" account, National Park Service: Provided further, That \$1,500,000 for the New England Conservatory shall be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470a upon designation as a National Historic Landmark.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment restores House language stricken by the Senate regarding the Boston Public Library, derives money for Penn Center from the Historic Preservation Fund, inserts a Senate provision regarding a Hot Springs, Arkansas flood study amended to include \$350,000 rather than \$450,000 as proposed by the Senate and inserts a Senate provision providing for a single procurement for the construction of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial.

The amendment also offsets the construction appropriation by \$4,377,000 with funds appropriated in P.L. 101-512 for the Keith Albee Theatre, provides \$1,500,000 for the New England Conservatory if it is designated a National Landmark and establishes conditions for transfer of \$400,000 to the City of Albuquerque for an environmental impact statement for a road either through or in the vicinity of Petroglyph NM.

URBAN PARK AND RECREATION FUND

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$5,000,000 for the Urban park and recreation fund as proposed by the House. The Senate had no similar provisions.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$95,250,000 for land acquisition and State assistance instead of \$89,460,000 as proposed by the House and \$95,587,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers agree to the following distribution:

Acadia NP, ME	\$3,500,000
Alaska National Park	
Areas	1,500,000
Appalachian Trail	6,000,000
Big Cypress NP, FL	3,000,000
Big South Fork WSR, TN ..	1,500,000
Brown V. Board of Education NHS, KS	175,000
Cape Cod NS, MA	825,000
Everglades NP, FL	3,000,000
Gettysburg NMP, PA	1,000,000
Golden Gate NRA	
(Phleger), CA	5,250,000
Indiana Dunes NL, IN	1,000,000
Kalaupapa NHP, HI	600,000
Little River Canyon NP, AL	6,000,000
Martin Luther King Jr NHS, GA	1,000,000
Mary McLeod Bethune House NHS, DC	635,000
Monocacy NB, MD	2,000,000
National Park of Samoa ..	300,000
Nez Perce NHP, OR	300,000
Palo Alto NB, TX	500,000
Pecos NM, NM	500,000
Petroglyph NM, NM	3,500,000
Saguaro NM, AZ	6,000,000
Salt River Bay NHP, VI ..	3,000,000
Santa Monica Mtns NRA, CA	4,000,000
Inholdings, Emergencies, Hardships	3,865,000
Acquisition Management ..	8,247,000
Subtotal, Federal acquisitions	67,197,000
Assistance to States:	
Matching grants	24,750,000

Administrative expenses	\$3,303,000
Subtotal, Assistance to States	28,053,000
Total, National Park Service	95,250,000

Money for the Appalachian Trail may be used for acquisitions in the Sterling Forest as long as it is in accord with the revised Appalachian Trail plan.

Paramount Ranch, Broome Ranch and properties in Zuma and Trancas Canyons, along the Backbone Trail and in Upper Topango Canyon are the only areas to which the \$4,000,000 for Santa Monica Mountains NRA is to be applied.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 27: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which allows the National Park Service to recover all costs of providing necessary services associated with special use permits, such reimbursements to be credited to the appropriation current at that time. The House had no such provision.

Amendment No. 28: Deletes House provision which limits overtime pay to any one individual employee of the United States Park Police to no more than \$20,000 per year. The managers will continue to monitor overtime to assure that it is not excessive.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

With regard to the coastal program, the managers recommend \$10,900,000. The differences from the House amounts are increases of \$100,000 for Lake Pontchartrain pollution studies and \$300,000 for coastal erosion and pollution studies in Hawaii, and decreases of \$100,000 for fundamental studies and \$300,000 for west central Florida erosion studies.

In addition to the funds specified in the coastal program for San Francisco Bay and the Florida Keys, the managers understand that funds from the marine portion of the program have also been allotted in support of these coastal studies for a total program of \$1,600,000 in San Francisco Bay and \$650,000 in the Florida Keys. These studies should be carried out according to the National Coastal Geology Program plan submitted to Congress earlier this year.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

LEASING AND ROYALTY MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$193,197,000 for leasing and royalty management as proposed by the House instead of \$192,897,000 as proposed by the Senate. There are two changes within the House-recommended amount. Environmental studies in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) lands activity are increased by \$100,000 and Federal audits in the royalty management program are decreased by \$100,000.

The managers agree that staffing reductions should not be applied to the Federal audit program and related activities, and expect the Minerals Management Service to ensure that contract buyout and buydown audits are addressed as quickly as possible. Staffing reductions also should be minimized in the environmental studies program. The managers suggest that the international program be examined for staffing reductions.

The managers do not object to the reprogramming of funds up to the Senate-recommended level for environmental studies from the OCS lands and general administra-

tion accounts to the extent such funds become available in fiscal year 1994. In particular, the headquarters OCS component should be reviewed as a potential reprogramming source.

Amendment No. 30: Earmarks \$65,796,000 for royalty management activities instead of \$65,896,000 as proposed by the House and \$64,896,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OIL SPILL RESEARCH

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$5,331,000 for oil spill research as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,681,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF MINES

MINES AND MINERALS

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$169,436,000 for mines and minerals instead of \$169,336,000 as proposed by the House and \$171,584,000 as proposed by the Senate. The changes to the House position include increases of \$200,000 in health, safety and mining technology for respirable dust control; \$200,000 in environmental technology, abandoned mine reclamation, for constructed wetlands research; and, in mineral institutes, \$200,000 for the generic center for respirable dust, \$75,000 for the marine minerals technology center, and \$125,000 for the National mine land reclamation center. The increases are partially offset by decreases of \$500,000 in minerals and materials science for materials research at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory and \$200,000 in environmental technology, control of mine drainage and liquid wastes, for constructed wetlands research.

No new funding has been provided for Western arctic coal research. The fiscal year 1993 funding for arctic coal research has not been expended and is available for research in fiscal year 1994. The siting and permit issues which caused the delay in project initiation recently have been resolved by the Bureau. The managers expect the Bureau to budget for needed ongoing research on arctic coal mining in future fiscal years.

The managers are concerned that insufficient emphasis is being placed on acid mine drainage research within the Department. Acid mine drainage continues to be a major problem at active and abandoned mine sites. This year the managers have become aware of two major watershed problems caused by acid mine drainage; one involving the Casselman River in Pennsylvania and the other affecting the Pitt Creek watershed in Oklahoma. The managers expect the Bureau of Mines to provide technical assistance in each of these areas to help characterize the extent of the problem and identify alternative solutions. For Casselman River, the Bureau should work with the Casselman River Task Force which was established to address the acid mine drainage in that area. For Pitt Creek, the Bureau should work with all interested parties, including the University of Oklahoma which has done some research into the problem. The managers urge the Department to support the development of a systematic approach to acid mine drainage characterization and technology development research within the Bureau. Such an approach will be far superior to the current piecemeal approaches being explored on a site by site basis. The managers expect the Bureau's fiscal year 1995 budget to include a strategic long-range plan for acid mine drainage research, with sufficient funds to execute year one of that plan in fiscal year 1995.

The managers expect the Department to examine the coordination among the Bureau

of Mines, the Minerals Management Service, and the U.S. Geological Survey on their marine minerals programs. In its March 1, 1994 report to the Committees on the advisability of transferring the marine minerals technology center to MMS, the Department should report on its plan to improve coordination and to ensure there is no duplication among the various marine minerals programs.

Amendment No. 33: Earmarks \$105,163,000 to remain available until expended for research programs instead of \$105,063,000 as proposed by the House and \$107,311,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

There are two changes within the House-recommended amount for the abandoned mine reclamation fund. In the Federal reclamation program high priority projects in non-program States and on Federal and Indian lands are decreased by \$250,000, and the rural abandoned mine program is increased by \$250,000.

Amendment No. 34: Deletes House language stricken by the Senate requiring that 16 full-time equivalent positions are maintained in the Wilkes-Barre, PA field office.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$1,490,805,000 for operation of Indian programs instead of \$1,492,650,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,489,885,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease from the amount proposed by the House consists of decreases of \$2,300,000 for tribal priority allocations; \$2,350,000 for non-recurring programs, including decreases of \$300,000 for Cheyenne River Sioux prairie dog management (leaving \$1,200,000) and \$2,300,000 for water rights negotiation/litigation, and an increase of \$250,000 for attorneys' fees; \$1,600,000 under Area Office operations; including \$1,500,000 for child protection centers and a \$100,000 general reduction; and a net increase of \$2,555,000 for other recurring programs, including increases of \$1,000,000 for contract support, \$1,400,000 for new tribes funding for the Catawba Tribe of SC, \$250,000 for the Navajo Community College, and \$905,000 for resources management, and a decrease of \$1,000,000 for education facilities O&M; and a net increase of \$1,850,000 for Central office operations, including decreases of \$250,000 for land records management and a \$300,000 general reduction, and increases of \$75,000 for the Office of the Commissioner, \$1,000,000 for emergency management improvements, \$75,000 for CFO Act implementation, \$200,000 for contract management, \$300,000 for financial management, \$200,000 for construction management, \$200,000 for ADP support, \$250,000 for education program management and \$100,000 for the Joint Commission on Alaska Natives.

The net increase of \$905,000 over the House for other recurring programs, resources management consists of the following changes from the House amounts:

Activity	Change
Irrigation O&M	+\$300,000
Bison initiative	-100,000
Native American Fish & Wildlife Society	-50,000
Shellfish management	-200,000
Great Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Commission	-100,000
Chippewa-Ottawa Treaty Fisheries Mgt. Auth	-25,000
Pacific Salmon Commission	-100,000

Activity	Change
Skagit Systems Cooperative	-\$25,000
Timber-fish-wildlife	+100,000
Klamath conservation	+200,000
Summit Lake hatchery	+85,000
Bering Sea Fishermen	+800,000
Pyramid Lake Tribe	+20,000
Total	+905,000

The amount included for Bering Sea Fishermen includes \$500,000 for upgrades of salmon restoration and hatchery enhancement facilities and \$300,000 for salmon monitoring and research programs. No funds are included for fish handling equipment and facilities or for commercial marketing. The Fishermen's Association is encouraged to apply for business development grants or community economic development grants for these activities.

The managers have provided \$20,000 for the Pyramid Lake Tribe for the payments of fees related to the tribe's water settlement. These funds are provided on a one-time basis only, and the managers expect that all future funds related to the settlement will be provided from the tribe's settlement funds.

The amount included for timber-fish-wildlife is one-time funding only, for tribal activities related to the Pacific NW Forest Plan in 1994. The base amount for this initiative will remain at the 1993 level.

The managers understand the need for all Federal agencies with jurisdiction over Washoe Indian Reservation lands to work with the Tribe to enter into cooperative agreements, make efforts to cross train officers and to make other arrangements necessary to improve law enforcement capabilities. Further, the Bureau of Indian Affairs should work with the Washoe Tribe to coordinate Federal assistance and ensure that much needed cooperative agreements are implemented promptly and properly.

The managers have agreed to a total funding level of \$7,002,000 for the Division of Accounting Management under Central Office operations. The managers agree that the Bureau may fill the additional positions needed in the Division to the extent funds can be made available within this total, including funds from savings in other parts of the Division's budget, such as travel and contractual services. Total spending for the Division for the fiscal year should be carefully monitored so that it does not exceed the above amount.

The managers have agreed to a total of \$91,223,000 for contract support, which includes \$6,415,000 for the self-governance tribes. Bill language proposed by the Senate earmarking the total amount available in 1994 has been modified to authorize payments of contract support shortfalls from previous years, based on amounts agreed to by tribes and the Inspector General's Office. Since making these prior year payments will reduce the amount of funds available for fiscal year 1994 contract support costs, the Bureau is directed to allocate funding in such a manner throughout the year that all tribes will be treated the same if there is a shortfall in contract support funds by the end of the year. The managers remain very concerned about the continued growth in contract support costs, and caution that it is unlikely that large increases for this activity will be available in future years' budgets. It is also a concern that significant increases in contract support will make future increases in tribal programs difficult to achieve. The managers believe the Bureau should look at establishing a self-determination fund for new or expanded contracting in

the 1995 budget. The Bureau should also work with the tribes on possible methodologies for establishing advance notification requirements for new contracting.

For education, daily attendance should be taken at Bureau-funded schools for the 1993-1994 school year. Daily attendance information should be consolidated at the agency/area level and reported to the Office of Indian Education Programs. The Bureau should submit quarterly reports which include monthly data on enrollment, daily attendance, and the attendance rate. Staffing statistics on instructional, support or administrative positions should be reported after the first and fourth quarters, and should include student-to-staff ratios. The Bureau should also submit by November 15, 1993 a list of schools whose student enrollment warrants an immediate review because of variances in student counts from the previous school year. Information should also include the schedule of ISEP (Indian School Equalization Program) reviews.

Statistical information should be provided on the number of students who transfer in or out of BIA-funded schools or non-BIA schools, or have dropped out. In order to track transferring students, the Bureau should use Social Security numbers, which are required as identification numbers in other Federally-funded programs. The initial quarterly report should be submitted in January, 1994.

The managers are aware of efforts by the Department and Bureau to review the ISEP formula. The managers expect the Department and Bureau to work closely together on this effort, and expect the Department and Bureau to submit a plan for the review prior to initiating any agreements with any non-Departmental entities. The plan should specifically identify all individuals involved and the costs for the review. Costs should include, among other items, travel, personnel, and contract/agreement costs. The managers have not provided any funding specifically for this purpose and expect that a reprogramming will be submitted if the total funds required for the review exceed \$250,000.

School operations funding has been provided on the basis of the 185 schools included in the fiscal year 1994 budget request. Any additional schools for which the Bureau receives applications should be funded only after funding has been requested for those schools.

The managers agree that self-governance shortfall funds may continue to be used for planning grants, if needed, and the Lummi education project in 1994. The report requested by the Senate on staffing and funding by area, and levels of contracting, should be provided by April 1, 1994.

The managers have included an increase of \$250,000 for attorneys' fees, and expect the Bureau to give priority consideration to a request for fees from Alaska Legal Services.

With regard to new tribes funding for the Tillie Hardwick tribes, and managers understand that the tribes have agreed on a distribution methodology, not based on population size.

The Catawba Tribe is expected to follow established procedures for obtaining funding for newly Federally-recognized tribes.

Within water rights negotiation funding, up to \$480,000 is to be provided to the Skokomish Tribe for activities related to Cushman Dam, and up to \$500,000 each is to be provided for the Klamath water rights adjudication and the Pyramid Lake economic development plan. Under real estate, \$250,000 is provided to continue the Yurok Cadastral Survey.

Within water resource planning, \$347,000 is included for the Muckleshoot Tribe.

With regard to trust funds management, the managers understand the Special Projects Team (SPT) has been incorporated into the Office of Trust Funds Management (OTFM). The managers intend for all staff of the SPT to report to and be under the supervision of the director of OTFM. The managers reiterate the importance of all personnel in the Department and the Bureau ensuring that all required notifications, consultations, and/or approvals are undertaken or received prior to proceeding with future organizational changes. With regard to systems development efforts, the managers expect the Department and Bureau to work with GAO to identify existing systems that could be used for trust funds management, rather than proceeding with any new systems development efforts.

The managers expect that \$500,000 will be provided for activities of the Joint Reorganization Task Force and an additional \$350,000 will be provided from Central Office funds in 1994 for continued development of the Tribal Budget System. Additional funds should be made available, if needed, to develop proposals aimed at streamlining workload and moving resources to the tribe or agency level. Any excess funds from those budgeted for the Planning Office may be used for this purpose. The managers understand that the funding for the Task Force includes funding for travel and activities of members of the Task Force only. Funding for travel and other activities for participants of Task Force activities who are not members of the Task Force comes from funding provided to the various programs of the Bureau. The managers expect the Bureau to work with the Task Force in developing the preliminary assessment of funding levels and inequities, and methods of distribution for equity funding in the future. The managers approve the process recommended by the Task Force for moving programs from other recurring programs to tribal priority programs based on tribal requests.

The report on the plan to downsize Central Office operations of the Bureau shall be submitted to the Committees by April 1, 1994.

The Bureau should re-examine its plans for the gaming staff and where it should be located, in line with the revised Indian Gaming legislation.

Under education, if the Bureau is not able to use all of the budgeted funds for early childhood education, such funds should be used for other school operations activities, such as the ISEP formula or transportation, as needed.

The Bureau should not shift any uncollected operation and maintenance charges at the Wapato irrigation project onto fee lands to cover revenue shortfalls from other non-paying land within the project. However, this does not preclude future operations and maintenance rate adjustments as may be determined necessary and consistent with applicable law, regulation and policy. The Department and Bureau should ensure that any rate adjustments are carried out in an equitable manner among all water users served by the project.

The managers agree that \$200,000 is provided for the Summer Institute administered by the American Indian Law Center at the University of New Mexico.

Funding to complete the fire fuel break project around Glenallen, Alaska, is provided through the Bureau of Land Management fire protection program.

Within the funds provided for law enforcement under tribal priority allocations, tran-

sitional funding is provided for the Sac and Fox detention center.

Bill language has been included directing the Bureau to form a Joint Task Force with Alaska Natives and the State of Alaska to determine what role the Bureau should play with regard to Alaska's rural schools and Alaska Native education, and what other resources might be identified to assist the educational program of these schools. Among other issues, the task force, with the membership as specified in the Senate report, should look at ways of improving educational achievement, including the use of telecommunications technology, and initiatives aimed at cultural preservation, health education and parenting education.

Consistent with the Administration's efforts to reduce unnecessary administrative expenditures, the Bureau should closely monitor travel costs. The managers have not imposed a funding limitation on travel. However, the managers expect the Central Office program managers, area office directors, and agency directors to review carefully meeting agendas where travel is required to ensure that meetings are centrally located and attendance is limited to essential personnel. Meetings should be organized to limit the amount of time that attendees are away from their normal work assignments to avoid disruption in services provided by the Bureau. To the extent possible, travel should be restricted for programs where funding shortfalls may occur. The Bureau should submit a list of all nationwide or area-wide meetings or conferences planned for 1994 including location, number and description of attendees, and expected costs by November 1, 1993. An updated list, including actual costs incurred to date, should be submitted to the Committees by April 1, 1994.

Amendment No. 36: Provides \$49,226,000 for housing and road maintenance programs as proposed by the Senate instead of \$52,582,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 37: Provides \$1,983,000 for litigation support as proposed by the House instead of \$2,483,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *Provided further, That of the amount appropriated under this head in Public Law 102-381, any unobligated balance as of September 30, 1993 related to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act shall remain available until expended and may be obligated under a grant to the Alaska Native Foundation for education, training, and technical assistance to Alaskan village corporations for reconveyance requirements*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The language will allow remaining fiscal year 1993 Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act funds, not to exceed \$250,000, to remain available as a grant to the Alaska Native Foundation for assistance to Alaskan village corporations.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: *Provided further, That not to exceed \$91,223,000 of the funds in this Act shall be available for payments to tribes and*

tribal organizations for indirect costs associated with contracts or grants or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, for fiscal year 1994 and previous years.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The managers have agreed to language which limits the amount for indirect costs associated with contracts, grants and compacts to \$91,223,000, and provides this amount for such costs incurred in 1994 and shortfall amounts from previous years. This matter is discussed in more detail under Amendment No. 35.

Amendment No. 40: Deletes Senate proposed language which addressed eligibility of Alaska Native villages for Indian roads program funding. The House had no similar provision. Based on written and oral confirmation that the BIA has provided, the managers understand that certain road projects in Craig, AK are in fact eligible to seek funding as Indian roads.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which includes all Indian reservation roads identified in the 1990 BIA Juneau Area Transportation Study in the BIA system for distribution of highway trust fund formula funds in fiscal year 1994. The provision will expire when the new BIA formula is implemented. The managers intend for any road funds distributed to the Juneau Area under this provision, or to any other area, which cannot be obligated in fiscal year 1994 to be redistributed to other areas which can obligate the funds by the end of the fiscal year.

Amendment No. 42: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides for review and approval of reorganization proposals by the Task Force on Bureau of Indian Affairs Reorganization and the Committees on Appropriations. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 43: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that funds appropriated for tribally-controlled community colleges distributed prior to September 30, 1994 and invested under current law are deemed to be in compliance with Title III of the Tribally Controlled Community Colleges Assistance Act. The House had no similar provision.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$166,979,000 for construction instead of \$172,799,000 as proposed by the House and \$150,429,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease from the amount proposed by the House consists of increases of \$700,000 under tribal government for contract support, \$180,000 under general administration for Cow Creek Band of Umpquas land acquisition, and \$1,450,000 for Bennett Freeze housing improvements; and decreases of \$2,000,000 under education for advance planning and design, \$4,000,000 under public safety and justice for the Sac and Fox detention center, and a net decrease of \$2,150,000 under resource management. This net decrease consists of increases of \$1,900,000 for Colorado River tribes irrigation project, \$200,000 for Hogback irrigation project, \$650,000 for Walker River irrigation project, and decreases of \$4,300,000 for the Navajo Indian irrigation project and \$600,000 for the San Carlos irrigation project.

Of the amount provided for the Walker River project, \$150,000 shall be used only for the tribal cost share of water monitoring by the U.S. Geological Survey.

The study requested in the House report on the possibility of establishing a construction/lease program and related legislative and administrative changes that would be required, should also address how the number of such facilities and related funding would be controlled were such a program to be implemented.

The managers have provided an additional \$4,000,000, to allow completion of the Chinle detention center, and have agreed to funding of \$4,000,000 included in the budget to allow the Sac and Fox detention center to begin construction in 1994. The Bureau should include funding to complete the Sac and Fox facility in the fiscal year 1995 budget.

The BIA should work with the State of Alaska Task Force on Rural Bulk Fuel Storage on issues related to aging fuel storage tanks in Alaska Native communities. The BIA should determine the ownership and responsibility for the storage tanks and submit a report on the cost of replacing the leaking tanks by October 1, 1994.

The managers have agreed to provide \$1,450,000 for Navajo housing improvements in the Bennett Freeze area. The managers have approved this one-time funding earmark to address some of the most pressing needs in the Bennett Freeze area. The funds are to be used to make repairs and renovations to existing homes. In cases where a home is determined to be unsafe or too deteriorated to repair or renovate, a replacement home may be built and the existing structure demolished. The managers encourage the tribe and the BIA to complete a survey of the housing needs in the Bennett Freeze area and to incorporate the results of the survey into existing funding mechanisms through the Bureau and other Federal agencies. To the extent the needs in the Bennett Freeze area greatly expand the existing backlog, increased funds should be requested in future budget requests for existing programs.

The managers note that the Hopi Tribe has appealed the court decision on the Bennett Freeze. The inclusion of funds for housing repairs is not intended in any way to jeopardize or take a position on that appeal.

Amendment No. 45: Deletes Senate proposed language that would have made funds provided previously or hereafter for the Wind River Irrigation Project non-reimbursable. A Solicitor's opinion from April, 1992 confirmed that legislation dating to 1905 made construction costs for the project reimbursable, and the tribes involved should seek a review by the appropriate authorizing committees of whether this designation should be changed.

TERRITORIAL AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$81,907,000 for administration of territories instead of \$82,107,000 as proposed by the House and \$81,457,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease from the amount proposed by the House consists of \$200,000 for American Samoa, \$100,000 each from operations and construction grants.

Amendment No. 47: Provides \$77,369,000 for technical and maintenance assistance, disaster recovery and grants instead of \$77,569,000 as proposed by the House and \$76,869,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease of \$200,000 under the amount proposed by the House is discussed under Amendment No. 46.

Amendment No. 48: Provides \$4,538,000 for the Office of Territorial and International

Affairs as proposed by the House instead of \$4,588,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which adds a reference to any subsequent legislation related to Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands covenant grant funding. In the absence of authorizing legislation providing differently, the managers intend for all covenant grant funding in fiscal year 1994 to be used for capital development projects only, and none to be used for government operations, and all such funds shall be subject to the Northern Marianas providing appropriate matching funds as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. All capital improvement funding shall be subject to applicable Federal grant regulations. In addition, of the \$27,220,000 included in the Act, \$3,000,000 should be made available for the American War Memorial Park, pursuant to an agreement between the Northern Marianas and the Secretary of the Interior regarding a new monument, wayside exhibits and definition of the park entrance and boundaries, and after consultation with the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides for the program of operations and maintenance improvement in the territories, the Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and the Freely Associated States. The House has no similar provision.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that disaster assistance funds may be used as non-Federal matching funds for Federal Emergency Management Administration grants. The House had no similar provision.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$23,838,000 for the Trust Territory instead of \$24,038,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,338,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease from the amount proposed by the House consists of a decrease of \$59,000 for Trust Territory administration and a net decrease of \$141,000 for Republic of Palau operations, including an increase of \$59,000 for the Weather Service and a decrease of \$200,000 for the operations grant.

The managers agree technical assistance funds should be provided to Palau for political education and other costs related to the referendum scheduled for November, based on a request from the Government of Palau.

The managers understand additional funds of up to \$700,000 may be required for the Koror-Babeldaob bridge project. If the Department agrees with the new estimates, there is no objection to reprogramming other available capital improvement funds to the bridge project.

Amendment No. 53: Provides \$18,464,000 for operations of the Government of Palau instead of \$18,605,000 as proposed by the House and \$17,964,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease of \$141,000 from the amount proposed by the House is discussed under Amendment No. 52.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The Office of Hearings and Appeals is expected to review the recommendations asso-

ciated with the Fish Alaska, Inc. equitable claim arising from Fish and Wildlife Service actions in the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge and report to the Committees no later than March 1, 1994.

ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION FUND

Amendment No. 54: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which appropriates \$7,000,000 to an ecosystem restoration fund to implement the President's Forest Plan for "Jobs in the Woods" ecosystem restoration in Northern California, Washington, and Oregon. The appropriation provides that the Secretary may transfer these funds to the Bureau of Land Management, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs for implementation. The House made no such appropriation.

The managers direct that none of the funds be used for rural community assistance, as funds for that purpose are contained in Forest Service appropriations.

The managers further agree that in future budget requests, funds for activities covered by this account should be requested in the regular agency appropriations accounts.

The managers encourage the Department of the Interior to give consideration to initiating a Wildstock Restoration Initiative in the State of Washington within Fish and Wildlife Service activities in the Ecosystems Restoration Fund.

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 55: Appropriations \$2,394,000 for construction management instead of \$2,494,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,194,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Given the current budget climate, dollars will continue to be constrained for the foreseeable future. One continuing drain on the funds needed to operate and maintain the public lands and their facilities is the pressure to continue to develop new and in many cases needed visitor and other facilities. The managers are concerned about their ability to meet the growing operations needs and address the capital improvement needs on the public lands.

The managers recommend that a task force be established under the leadership of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget to review the Department's construction programs for BLM, FWS and the NPS. This team should include a representative from each of the three agencies as well as a representative from the Assistant Secretary's office. The managers recommend that the task force consider all options for restructuring the construction program including a consolidated approach to Department construction operations. This may include a recommendation that Denver Service Center operations be discontinued with more responsibilities handled in the regional offices or in the parks where appropriate. The team should also consider ways to build incentives into the system so that all parties, including Denver, the regions and the parks control project costs and scope. This may include the use of more localized architects and engineers and construction project managers.

In reviewing the construction programs the managers recommend the task force review methods of controlling the costs and scope of construction projects. Particularly with respect to larger projects, it may be feasible and advisable for the agencies to provide a range of alternatives for meeting

the management objective. It is also recommended that the general management planning process be reviewed for it is at this point that many of the expectations for development first become established.

**NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for the National Indian Gaming Commission as proposed by the House instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 57: Deletes House provision prohibiting the use of funds in the Act for accepting and processing applications for patents and on patenting Federal lands under the general mining laws, as proposed by the Senate. Legislation dealing with this issue is under active consideration in the Congress.

Amendment No. 58: Deletes House provision providing exceptions to the limitations contained in Amendment No. 57, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Deletes House provision prohibiting the use of funds for operation and support of Grazing Advisory Boards, as proposed by the Senate. Grazing Advisory Boards are addressed in Amendment No. 123.

Amendment No. 60: Deletes Senate provision which prohibited an increase in entrance fees at the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge, Maryland. The managers understand that the Department has agreed not to increase these fees in fiscal year 1994.

The managers are aware of concerns that the proposed fee increases at Blackwater may have resulted in a fee level incompatible with fees charged at other nearby non-Federal facilities and may have had an adverse impact on visitation to the refuge. The managers expect the Fish and Wildlife Service to examine expanding the number of refuges in the fee collection program, implementing more effective methods of fee collection at refuges that are not recovering their expenses, or shifting the burden more to commercial users of the refuges, before considering proposals to increase entrance fees at Blackwater.

Amendment No. 61: Deletes Senate provision prohibiting the use of funds to implement an agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and Save Our Cumberland Mountains, Inc. (SOCM). The Secretary has assured the managers that the Department will not execute a new agreement with SOCM but will implement through directives, memoranda of understanding, and rulemaking those principles from the draft agreement needed to ensure sound government policy. The managers expect the Department and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement to follow appropriate rulemaking procedures and to solicit and objectively consider the comments of all interested parties prior to implementing any policy changes. In particular, the States should be consulted fully on any changes to the operation and maintenance of the Applicant Violator System.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Retain the matter inserted by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the first section number named in said amendment, insert: 114

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment deems the holder of permit LP-GLBA005-93 to be a person who, on or before January 1, 1979, was engaged in adequately providing visitor services of the type authorized in the permit within Glacier Bay National Park.

**TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE
FOREST RESEARCH**

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$193,083,000 for forest research as proposed by the House instead of \$192,983,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within this amount, there is an increase of \$300,000 over the amount proposed by the House for resource analysis, for the Southwestern forestry research program; and a decrease of \$300,000 under forest management research, for the Washington Forest Landscape Management Project.

INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY

Amendment No. 64: Deletes the International Forestry account as proposed by the Senate. This account is addressed under amendment No. 67.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates \$168,107,000 for State and private forestry instead of \$148,955,000 as proposed by the House and \$169,107,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount proposed by the House consists of decreases of \$1,000,000 for forest pest management, \$2,478,000 for the stewardship program, \$2,068,000 for stewardship incentives/tree planting, \$1,000,000 to urban forestry, and \$250,000 to Northern forest lands study; and increases of \$1,000,000 for rural development in the Northeast and Midwest, \$500,000 for seedlings and nurseries, \$10,000,000 for community assistance and \$5,000,000 for old growth diversification related to the Pacific Northwest Forest Plan, \$6,948,000 for Forest Legacy, and \$2,500,000 for the Columbia River Gorge Skamania Conference Center. In addition to the \$1,000,000 reduction in pest management, the managers have also agreed to transfer \$3,000,000 from pest suppression (\$1,500,000 each from the Federal and cooperative programs) to fire protection within this account.

The earmarks contained in both the House and Senate reports for urban forestry and stewardship incentives are maintained, with the exception of \$2,100,000 for the Metropolitan Greenspace Demonstration program.

The managers have agreed to additional funds for the seedlings and nurseries program, and encourage the State of Alaska to seek funds from this source for its genetics and tree improvement facilities.

Under special projects, \$100,000 is provided to WOODNET and the Northwest Forest Products Consortium in Washington State, for purposes of continued development of a regional demonstration export assistance and diversification program in the Pacific Northwest.

With respect to the Washington share of the funding for old growth diversification projects, these funds are to be provided through the Washington State Department of Trade and Economic Development—Forest Products Value-Added Program.

With regard to the Forest Legacy program, any political subdivision within New York State must agree to include itself, in order to participate in the program. A subdivision is defined as a village, city, town, or county.

The managers are aware of rural development efforts in the Hamakua, HI area and expect the Forest Service to consider any proposals from this program in the context

of the rural development program, to the same extent consideration would be given to other rural development proposals using forestry.

Amendment No. 66: Modifies language proposed by the House to provide that a grant of \$2,500,000 shall be provided to the Texas Reforestation Foundation from funds previously appropriated to the National Tree Trust. The House had proposed a grant of \$3,000,000. Any such grant should be consistent with the overall program goals and objectives of the National Tree Trust.

INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY

Amendment No. 67: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which establishes an International Forestry account and appropriates \$6,996,000. The House had included this account in a different location and included an appropriation of \$11,996,000, which was stricken by the Senate in Amendment No. 64, previously discussed.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Amendment No. 68: Deletes reference to Forest Service Law Enforcement as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *\$1,304,891,000, including not less than \$55,552,000 for law enforcement*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment appropriates \$1,304,891,000 for the national forest system instead of \$1,237,272,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,300,153,000 as proposed by the Senate, and includes language earmarking not less than \$55,552,000 for law enforcement within this account.

The increase over the amount proposed by the House consists of increases of \$5,957,000 for cooperative law enforcement, \$9,633,000 for NFS drug control, \$39,962,000 for NFS law enforcement, \$9,300,000 for timber sales, and \$12,017,000 for transfer of law enforcement funds; and decreases of \$1,500,000 for trail maintenance, \$1,700,000 for recreation management, \$350,000 for wilderness, \$350,000 for cultural resources, \$3,150,000 for wildlife and fish (including \$250,000 for neotropical migratory birds, \$500,000 for wildlife habitat monitoring, \$400,000 for inland fish management, \$750,000 for TE&S species recovery and \$250,000 for preventing listings, \$800,000 for anadromous fish management, and a general reduction of \$200,000), \$500,000 for range management, and \$1,700,000 for soil and water improvements.

Under timber sales, the managers have included \$2,000,000 of the \$4,000,000 increase proposed by the House for costs of converting all new timber sales to tree measurement in 1994. Additional funds for this purpose, up to the total of \$4,000,000, are available within the contingency funds of \$8,000,000 which were reduced by the House and which have been restored to the budget. The increase over the House for timber sales also includes an increase of \$3,500,000 for harvest administration and a general reduction of \$200,000.

Under the NFS law enforcement line item, the managers have included \$888,000 transferred from the Construction account. Additional amounts that will be available to the

law enforcement organization in 1994 are \$8,497,000 from Fire protection and \$2,632,000 from permanent appropriations. The total available for law enforcement in 1994 will be \$66,681,000. The law enforcement funding from Fire protection should be transferred to the NFS law enforcement line item in the 1995 budget request, and the request should also indicate how much it is estimated will be made available from permanent appropriations for law enforcement each year. The managers have also agreed to increases over the budgeted amounts of \$500,000 for the timber theft task force and \$400,000 for criminal investigations.

With regard to the organizational structure for the law enforcement program, the managers direct the Forest Service to establish a separate, independent chain of command for the staff working on criminal investigation activities, with all levels of this organization (forest or region) reporting directly to the chief law enforcement officer in the Washington office, who will report directly to the Chief of the Forest Service. At no level of the organization (district, forest, or regional office) should criminal investigations personnel report to or be under the supervision of anyone other than the appropriate law enforcement supervisor. For the general law enforcement personnel, the organization will be as recently revised by the Forest Service to conform with the recommendations of the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency. The managers reiterate the importance of maintaining complete investigative independence, and expect any personnel who fail to comply with the law or who interfere with criminal investigations to be disciplined appropriately. The managers also expect the Forest Service to impose severe penalties on any personnel who fail to refer potential criminal activities to the law enforcement or criminal investigations staff for determination of appropriate action. For oversight purposes, a copy of all criminal investigations initiated in the Forest Service should be provided to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources.

The funding recommended by the managers for the timber sales program is essentially the same as requested in the budget, with slight adjustments due to the shift to tree measurement sales. The managers have not included any specific distribution of the fiscal year 1994 timber sales program on a regional basis because of the considerable uncertainty that exists in the program at the present time. In allocating the resources provided, however, the Forest Service should be attentive to the areas where the greatest opportunity exists for sales to proceed, and taking into account such factors as current on-the-ground conditions, the need to comply fully with existing legal requirements, the certainty of the timber base as a result of legislation and land management plans, current market demand, and actual sale and harvest activity in each of the regions in recent years. No specific reductions are to be allocated to a forest solely on the basis of a below cost determination.

Some of the funds included in the budget for contingency costs associated with the need to bring the Forest Service organization to a size compatible with the decreased timber program are retained. These funds may be used to address market demand requirements in the event they are not needed for other purposes. In addition, the managers have included bill language providing the Forest Service with "early out" authority so that the need for costly reductions in force

and relocations might be kept to a minimum. Savings resulting from use of these authorities are to be retained in the program in order to address the increased costs associated with tree measurement, ecosystem management, and watershed work.

With respect to below cost, the Forest Service should continue to implement the recommendations of the cost efficiency study in order to achieve cost savings in the program. The Service should engage in further review of the program with flexibility available in the different regions to consider alternatives to enhance the likelihood of achieving positive results, while remaining sensitive to the local and community impacts of the timber sales program. Ecosystem management, tree measurement, and other changes in the way of doing business on the national forests may increase the costs of the timber program without leading to a commensurate increase in timber values, which may affect the gain/loss calculation on forests nationwide. This situation increases the need for the Forest Service to become more proactive in its review process as it evaluates the potential costs and revenues of sales before investing large sums of money into timber sales preparation. The managers encourage the Administration to continue reviewing options for dealing with below cost sales while remaining responsive to these concerns. The managers do not direct or prohibit the Forest Service from considering the use of minimum bids in fiscal year 1994. However, if minimum bids are considered, the Forest Service should make every effort to minimize the organizational overhead costs included in such a rate, and should clearly link the bid rate with the direct costs associated with specific sales. Any consideration of minimum bids should also be responsive to the timber sale economics in different regions of the country, including terrain, species, values, and other factors.

With respect to the Pacific Northwest and the follow-up to the Forest Conference, funding is included for both the Interior Department and the Forest Service to engage in watershed assessment and restoration activities. Additional funds are provided in the State and Private Forestry account to deal with some of the community assistance aspects of the program. If additional needs are identified for fiscal year 1994, the Forest Service should comply with the Committees' reprogramming guidelines. This requirement includes any proposed use of the Secretary's transfer authorities. The primary focus for the watershed work should be on completing the necessary assessment work for the key watersheds. To aid in this effort, language is included allowing use of salvage funds for this purpose, up to a total of \$26,000,000. These efforts are to be undertaken using the interagency team approach, involving other agencies as well as Forest Service Research and State and Private Forestry, and overhead costs are to be kept to a minimum. The Forest Service should report to the Committees on Appropriations no later than December 15, 1993, on the following issues related to watershed work: proposed methodology for allocating funds, accountability for expenditure of funds, how the costs of watershed work will be measured in comparison to base funding provided, and procedures to be used for monitoring.

In addition to the use of up to \$26,000,000 from salvage funds for watershed assessment work, the managers have agreed to the retention of prior year language regarding uses of the salvage fund. No specific earmarks are provided, but attention should be given to

the drought and forest health problems in the Eastside of Washington and Oregon, the Sierras, the Tahoe Basin, the Chugach NF, and the Francis Marion NF.

The specific language related to log scaling and tree measurement is discussed under amendment no. 81. The switch to tree measurement is for sales to be prepared in fiscal year 1994, and is not a direction that sales already prepared are to be reworked. The managers expect the Forest Service to continue to negotiate with the holders of long term contracts to switch to tree measurement sales for fiscal year 1995. In the event negotiations are not successful, the terms of the existing contracts would continue. The Forest Service should continue to engage in the necessary activities to ensure that its personnel are properly trained and certified in the quality and accuracy of the tree measurement system. This includes making sure that cruise design standards are in place, and that check cruise validations occur.

With respect to the Tongass NF, the managers estimate that the timber sales preparation level in 1994 will be between 280 million board feet, the House proposed level, and 420 million board feet, the level proposed by the Senate. The managers note there are contingency funds in the timber sales budget which can be drawn upon to prepare sales for the higher level, or whatever actual level is achievable based on current market conditions and legal requirements. This preparation level combined with work to enhance the timber pipeline over the last three years is scheduled to bring the pipeline to about a three years' supply level in the Tongass NF.

With reference to the language in the House report regarding group selection in Region 5, the managers are unaware if the recent report on the Sierra range referred to has been subject to formal peer review by the scientific community. The managers understand there is not unanimity of support for group selection among the scientific, environmental, and industrial communities as there is not unanimity of support for the interim CASPO (California Spotted Owl) strategy. The managers understand that the Forest Service will continue to implement the CASPO strategy, adopted as an interim strategy by the Forest Service on March 1, 1993 for now, which in contrast to group selection was subject to peer review. The managers, however, expect Region 5 of the Forest Service to continue to consider and review fully innovative forest management practices as alternatives to the interim CASPO strategy which are generally consistent with the applicable principles of the Forest Conference and Administration's policies. The managers understand that one of the alternatives being considered through the EIS process is group selection.

Within the funds provided, there is \$1,000,000 each in OR and WA to continue harvest cutting and silviculture demonstrations, and to initiate two new restoration projects in young stands, in conjunction with the Olympic Natural Resources Center. Within the \$1,000,000 for OR, \$750,000 is to continue the demonstration program on the Umpqua NF, which includes the Douglas Project among the partners; and \$250,000 is to initiate the new demonstration project.

The managers understand that the \$200,000 earmarked in both the House and Senate reports for studying the conversion of roads to trails will be used for such studies on as many forests as possible in Region 6, with the Gifford Pinchot NF being the first priority.

The managers are aware of concerns regarding the process used by the Forest Service in allocating funds among the various

forests and regions, and are particularly troubled about reports that the funding levels for some forests have been reduced in order to fund other forests. While one forest is not to be funded at the expense of the others, with limited budgetary resources and changing policy direction, no forest can be guaranteed a funding level from one year to the next. These allocations must necessarily be made each year by the Forest Service. Although the Forest Service may take into consideration the funding levels provided in prior years in allocating its funds, as well as other appropriate factors such as the forest plans, the plans should not be the sole basis for allocating funds, since the budget assumptions of the plans are not necessarily consistent from one forest to the next. As the managers have stated previously, earmarks agreed to in final conference action are to be considered a part of the affected forest's base, unless identified to the contrary in the next year's budget.

FOREST SERVICE LAW ENFORCEMENT

Amendment No. 70: Deletes the separate appropriation for law enforcement as proposed by the Senate. This matter is discussed under Amendment No. 69.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 71: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: \$249,002,000, including road obliteration and watershed restoration

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment appropriates \$249,002,000 for construction instead of \$237,423,000 as proposed by the House and \$264,795,000 as proposed by the Senate, and adds language authorizing use of the funds for road obliteration and watershed restoration. The increase over the amount proposed by the House consists of decreases of \$888,000 for transfer to the law enforcement program under the National forest system account (including decreases of \$15,000 from facilities and \$873,000 from roads), and \$10,000,000 for the watershed restoration program, leaving \$20,000,000; and increase of \$2,867,000 for facilities, \$19,000,000 for road construction, (including increases of \$3,000,000 for timber roads, \$12,000,000 for purchaser construction support, \$1,000,000 for recreation roads, and \$3,000,000 for general purpose roads), and \$600,000 for trails.

The increase for facilities includes the following changes from the amounts proposed by the House:

Project	Change
Wayne, NF Supervisor's Office	-\$130,000
Recreation:	
Lewis and Clark visitors center, MT	+300,000
Columbia River Gorge Discovery Center	+1,186,000
Ocoee River	+1,840,000
Wayne NF, OH	-246,000
National Forests, TX	-665,000
Badin Lake, Uwharrie NF, NC	-250,000
Winding Stair Mountain Ketchikan, AK visitors center	+1,100,000
Seneca Rocks, WV visitors center	+3,147,000
Toiyabe NF, NV	+600,000
Wenatchee NF, WA	+\$200,000

Project	Change
White Mountain NF, NH El Portal visitors center, PR	+\$400,000
Cradle of Forestry, NC	-2,400,000
General reduction	-500,000
Subtotal	-2,500,000
Transfer to NFS law enforcement	+2,867,000
.....	-15,000
Total	+2,852,000

The remaining funds for the National Forests in TX are for the Boles Field and Boykin Springs projects. Of the funds for Badin Lake, \$250,000 is for a water line to serve the recreation complex. Within the funds for the Toiyabe NF, up to \$300,000 may be used for the Spring Mountain NRA management plan.

The managers have included \$300,000 for planning and design of the Lewis and Clark visitors center, MT, and \$228,000 is included, as requested in the budget, for planning the Hudson, NE education and learning center. The additional \$600,000 earmarked in the Senate report for the Lewis and Clark center is not agreed to, and should be used for the projects for which these funds were originally budgeted. These funds are provided on the basis that they will be matched on a 50/50 cost-sharing basis from non-Federal sources. The managers also agree that the total scope of these two projects should be reduced, so that total costs for completing construction of these centers do not exceed \$6,000,000 each. The managers have agreed that Federal funds will be provided on a 50/50 cost-sharing basis for completion of these projects, for a total estimate not to exceed \$3,000,000 in Federal funds for each facility. It is the expectation of the managers that additional appropriations for these projects funds is available.

The managers have agreed that they will consider funding for new visitors centers in the future if such facilities are of reasonable scope and cost, on a 50/50 Federal/non-Federal cost-sharing basis. The managers are aware of the proposed Northern Great Lakes visitors center in WI, and the commitment from the WI State Legislature and Governor to provide 50 percent funding for the project. The Forest Service is expected to review any funding request for this facility in line with the above policy, and to include funding in the 1995 budget request or in a proposed reprogramming to the Committees in fiscal year 1994 if a decision is made to proceed with the project.

With regard to the comprehensive management plan revision for the Hell's Canyon NRA, the managers have earmarked \$200,000 in the National Forest System account and \$120,000 in the Construction account for the plan revision process in fiscal year 1994, which was budgeted for the Dug Bar recreation facilities construction. The managers encourage the Forest Service to proceed with the revision as expeditiously as possible. While the plan is being revised, the managers agree that up to \$2,170,000 in construction funds including roads, facilities and trails may be spent in fiscal year 1994 for projects in the NRA, including road rehabilitation aimed at safety improvements and resource protection, and overlooks. The managers request the Forest Service to review, each project before proceeding to determine if it is a project which should be reexamined during the plan revision process. The Forest Service should not spend funds in 1994 for new recreation site development (excluding overlooks) or other facilities which might be reconsidered as part of the plan revision process.

The managers understand the budget contains \$340,000 in facilities funds and \$140,000 in trails funds for the Red Bluff Recreation Area, Mendocino NF, and the budget also contains \$425,000 for Tahoe/Tallac, \$5,613,000 for Mount St. Helens, \$450,000 for Multnomah Falls, and \$4,300,000 for Corney Lake.

The increase in trails consists of a general reduction of \$500,000 and an increase of \$1,100,000 for the Glendale to Powers, OR bicycle trail.

The managers have included \$20,000,000 for comprehensive watershed restoration activities on the westside forests of Washington, Oregon and northern California, with funds to be distributed proportionately, based on the highest priority watersheds. The House had included \$30,000,000 for these projects, and the Senate had included \$17,000,000. The funds are to be used both for road projects, such as road closure, obliteration, revegetation and drainage improvements, and watershed projects such as riparian revegetation, erosion control, and slide stabilization. The first priority for these funds should be to secure key watersheds, and rehabilitation projects should be undertaken only when watershed inventory and analysis have been completed (funds for these assessments have been provided for under the salvage sales fund). Projects selected should be those with the greatest impact on factors limiting salmon spawning, rearing and holding habitat, and projects with the greatest long-term positive impact should be favored over those with short-term benefits.

As discussed under the National Forest System account, the managers expect that projects will proceed only after proper analysis and planning take place through an interagency team review. An interagency, interdisciplinary scientific review team should be established to review and approve any existing "off the shelf" projects, as well as new projects, to ensure projects selected will provide the most ecological benefits for the dollar. Projects in key watersheds in which inventory, long-range planning, and cost/benefit analysis have been completed should receive priority in allocating funds. The managers reiterate the examples of projects to receive priority consideration listed in the House report, including the Skagit River Wild and Scenic Management Area because of its scenic and ecological importance.

Within road construction funds, there is \$562,000 for the Wayne NF, OH and \$85,000 for the Bankhead NF, AL. Within trail construction funds, there is \$700,000 for the Bankhead NF, AL, \$120,000 for the Allegheny NF, PA, and \$400,000 for the Wayne NF, OH.

Amendment No. 72: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: \$20,000,000 is for watershed restoration; \$99,347,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment provides for \$20,000,000 to be available for watershed restoration and \$99,347,000 to be available for construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities within the construction appropriation in 1994. The House had proposed \$96,495,000 for facilities construction, and the Senate had proposed \$97,867,000. Neither the House nor Senate had included an earmark for watershed restoration in the bill, although both had earmarked an amount for this purpose in the report accompanying the bill. The

changes from the amounts proposed by the House for these activities are discussed under Amendment No. 71.

Amendment No. 73: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which provides \$129,655,000 for construction and repair of forest roads and trails instead of \$140,228,000 as proposed by the House and \$166,928,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The changes from the amount proposed by the House are discussed under Amendment No. 71.

LAND ACQUISITION

Amendment No. 74: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment that appropriates \$64,250,000 for land acquisition instead of \$56,700,000 as proposed by the House and \$51,050,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The managers agree to the following distribution:

Alpine Lakes Management Area, WA	\$700,000
Appalachicola NF, FL	2,000,000
Appalachian Trail	2,000,000
Caribbean NF, PR	450,000
Chattooga WSR, NC, SC, GA	2,000,000
Cherokee NF, TN	550,000
Cleveland NF, CA	2,000,000
Colorado Wilderness Inholdings	1,250,000
Columbia Gorge NSA, OR, WA	1,000,000
Croatan NF, NC	500,000
Daniel Boone, NF, KY	2,000,000
Finger Lakes NF, NY	800,000
Flathead NF, MT	500,000
Francis Marion NF, SC	850,000
Gallatin NF, MT	3,000,000
Green Mountain NF, VT	3,000,000
Hoosier NF, IN	500,000
Kisatchie NF, LA	500,000
Lake Tahoe Basin, CA, NV	2,000,000
Little Beaver Creek W&SR, OH	2,200,000
Los Padres NF, CA	2,000,000
Mark Twain NF, MO	1,000,000
Michigan Lakes and Streams	500,000
Mount Baker-Snoqualmie NF, WA	1,300,000
Old Chief Joseph Grave Site, OR	(300,000)
Olympic NF, WA	1,000,000
Oregon Dunes NRA, OR	5,200,000
Osceola NF (Pinhook Swamp), FL	1,500,000
Ouachita NF, AR, OK	500,000
Ozark NF, AR	1,000,000
Pacific Northwest Streams	1,900,000
Roosevelt NF (Cherokee Park), CO	2,700,000
Salmon WSR, ID	1,700,000
San Bernardino NF, CA	1,000,000
Shawnee NF, IL	400,000
Superior NF, MN	300,000
Talladega NF, AL	300,000
Toiyabe NF, CA	1,000,000
Toiyabe NF, NV	2,200,000
Uwharrie NF, NC	500,000
Wayne NF, OH	500,000
Emergency, inholdings	1,750,000

Acquisition Management .. \$8,500,000

Total, Forest Service .. 64,250,000

The \$500,000 for Croatan NF, NC does not commit the managers to future appropriations.

The managers expect the Forest Service to complete expeditiously the study mandated by the recently passed Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 regarding inholdings in the Spanish Peaks planning area. Also the managers direct the Forest Service to provide the Committees on Appropriations a report on the status of all Forest Service wilderness inholdings, including information about the conflicts such inholdings pose for wilderness management.

The managers direct the Forest Service to use the Pacific Northwest Stream funds to support the highest priority projects within the region. The managers further expect that resources provided will be divided equitably between projects in Oregon and Washington.

The managers understand that the \$2,200,000 in funding for land acquisition in the Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada will complete the purchase of the Fibreboard properties. The managers direct the funds to be used exclusively to conclude the Fibreboard acquisition in fiscal year 1994.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 75: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert; and for timber sales preparation to replace sales lost to fire or other causes, and sales preparation to replace sales inventory on the shelf for any national forest to a level sufficient to maintain new sales availability equal to a rolling five-year average of the total sales offerings, and for design, engineering, and supervision of construction of roads lost to fire or other causes associated with the timber sales programs described above, and for watershed assessment activities: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, monies received from the timber salvage sales program shall be considered as money received for purposes of computing and distributing 25 per centum payments to local governments under 16 U.S.C. 500, as amended.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The language provides for the use of salvaged sale funds for timber sales preparation to replace sales lost to fire or other causes and to replace sales inventory on the shelf, and for the 25 per centum payments to local governments from salvage sales receipts. The language has been modified from prior years to include watershed assessment activities as an allowable use of the fund. The Forest Service may use up to \$26,000,000 in salvage funds for watershed assessment activities. As discussed under Amendment Nos. 68 and 71, the primary focus for the watershed work should be to complete the assessment work for the key watersheds before proceeding with restoration projects on a piecemeal basis. These efforts are to be undertaken using the interagency team approach.

Amendment No. 76: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which deletes House language on the Shawnee NF and inserts Senate language prohibiting the use of funds for clearcutting or even aged management in hardwood stands on the

Shawnee NF to the greatest extent possible and in accordance with the Shawnee NF plan.

Amendment No. 77: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used for timber sale planning or scoping using clearcutting in the Quachita and Ozark-St. Francis National Forests in Arkansas, except for sales that are necessary as a result of natural disaster or a threat to forest health, or for maintaining or enhancing wildlife habitat, or habitat for endangered and threatened species, or for research purposes.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment changes language included in different forms by both the House and Senate to prohibit the use of funds for clearcutting in the Quachita and Ozark-St. Francis National Forests in Arkansas, with certain specified exemptions.

Amendment No. 78: Deletes House proposed language and Senate proposed language which would have prohibited the use of funds to alter the forest stand composition in the Ozark-St. Francis and Ouachita National Forests in Arkansas.

Amendment No. 79: Restores House proposed language which had been stricken by the Senate, which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to plan or conduct timber sales or build roads in three specified areas of the Chattahoochee NF, GA. Such activities will be deferred until a revision of the forest's land management plan, which will address possible designation of the three areas as wilderness or scenic areas, is completed.

Amendment No. 80: Strikes House language authorizing salvage sales in Regions 5 and 6 with certain conditions, as proposed by the Senate. This matter is addressed under Amendment No. 118.

Amendment No. 81: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

None of the funds available to the Forest Service in this Act shall be used to begin preparation of timber sales in fiscal year 1994 using the scaling method: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to timber salvage sales: Provided further, That thinning sales may be prepared using the scaling method if determined by the Regional Forester to be the most effective means of achieving a stated environmental objective: Provided further, That this limitation shall not apply to sales prepared pursuant to existing timber contracts: Provided further, That any timber sales prepared during fiscal year 1994 which involve the use of the scaling method must be scaled by the Forest Service, or under contracts issued by the Forest Service and paid for using deposits by the timber purchaser.

Total outlays by the Forest Service pursuant to the cooperative work trust funds accounts (12-8028-0-7-302) shall not exceed \$279,668,000 in fiscal year 1994.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment revises the House proposed language requiring new timber sales prepared in fiscal year 1994 to be prepared as tree measurement, or lump sum, sales, to

add certain exceptions for salvage and thinning sales; and adds language proposed by the Senate as part of Amendment No. 124, which provides a cap on Knutson-Vandenberg (K-V) funds for fiscal year 1994, in the amount of \$279,668,000.

With regard to the scaling language, in the case of the exceptions for salvage or thinning sales, the Forest Service is to scale the logs using its own personnel, or is to enter into contracts to provide scaling or weighing services for obtaining volumes of these sales. If contracts are entered into, the Forest Service is to require the timber purchaser to pay for these services by depositing funds into a cooperative account. In this manner, the Forest Service will have direct contract authority over the organization providing the scaling services.

Before any salvage or thinning sales are prepared as scaled sales, the Forest Service should issue policy guidance to all its regions as to how such sales will be defined consistently throughout the National Forest System. Once the policy guidance is issued, sales proposed to be categorized as salvage or thinning sales should be forwarded to the Regional Forester for review and compliance with the policy. The managers believe this step is necessary in order to prevent abuses in the way in which salvage and thinning are defined. The managers have provided the flexibility for the use of scaling in salvage and thinning sales this fiscal year, but if misuses of the definition occur, it is unlikely that this flexibility would be continued in future years. The managers also request a report be provided by April 1, 1994, with a final update after the end of the fiscal year, showing the volume contained in salvage and thinning sales by region for fiscal year 1993, and the volume of such sales by region for fiscal year 1994.

Amendment No. 82: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which authorizes reimbursement of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for administration of the stewardship incentives program, not to exceed 10 percent of the program funding level. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 83: Deletes Senate language providing a pilot program for land management stewardship end result contracts on certain national forests. The managers are aware of the progress made with these contracts, and expect projects under the pilot program to continue in fiscal year 1994. The Forest Service should complete the review requested in House report 103-158. In addition, if these pilot projects prove to be another tool to address ecosystem management objectives, the Administration should come forward with a legislative proposal for consideration by the relevant authorizing committees.

Amendment No. 84: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities for sustainable rural development purposes.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The language allows the Forest Service to use appropriated funds to assist rural com-

munities located both within and outside the boundaries of National forest system lands.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CONTRACTOR PAY FREEZE

The Administration submitted a budget amendment reducing requests for the various Department of Energy accounts for fiscal year 1994 by amounts estimated to be saved in implementing a one-year freeze on certain contractor salaries. In the case of Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves and Strategic Petroleum Reserves such reductions had already been considered and made. For energy conservation, fossil energy research and development, and the Energy Information Administration, reductions are being made that the managers believe in total more than offset the need for specific additional reductions for the pay freezes.

COORDINATION OF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The managers are aware of increased Federal efforts related to research, development, demonstration, and commercialization of fuel cells, alternative fuels, natural gas, coal, and electric and other vehicle technology and related infrastructure. The managers are concerned that these Federal efforts be well coordinated to avoid inefficient duplication. The managers expect the Secretary of Energy to ensure that within the Department of Energy, related programs are well coordinated and that technology transfer efforts of the national laboratories are coordinated through the relevant research and development programs. To ensure that these programs are coordinated with other Federal agencies, the managers expect the Secretary of Energy to seek to execute agreements with other Federal agencies which describe the respective responsibilities of the agencies involved in the programs. The Secretary should submit a report by April 1, 1994, on these efforts, both within the Department of Energy and with other agencies. Fiscal year 1995 budget material should include the level of both Department and other Federal efforts for each affected program.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 85: Appropriates \$430,674,000 for fossil energy research and development instead of \$433,163,000 as proposed by the House and \$429,070,000 as proposed by the Senate. The net decrease below the amount proposed by the House consists of increases of \$625,000 for coal technology export, and \$2,000,000 for materials development, both in advanced research and technology development; \$2,000,000 in direct liquefaction to begin support of bench-scale work using Exxon facilities; \$1,750,000 for advanced concepts in pressurized fluidized bed combustion; \$2,000,000 for work on externally-fired systems in advanced combustion technology; \$850,000 to complete briquetting and coking facilities and operations at existing CTC facilities for coproducts production in coal gasification; \$1,000,000 for the Oil Recovery Technology Partnership, \$500,000 for thermodynamics research at the National Institute for Petroleum and Energy Research (NIPER), and \$350,000 for continued work on the Gypsy field by the University of Oklahoma, all in advanced extraction and process technology; \$2,000,000 for the reservoir class field program in light oil enhanced oil recovery; \$500,000 for the new drilling technology initiative in gas resource and extraction; \$350,000 to provide for light hydrocarbons to liquids research at the University of Oklahoma in gas utilization; \$1,000,000 for the university consortium, and \$1,000,000 for Morgantown Energy Technology Center

(METC) work both in high efficiency gas turbine development in gas utilization; \$250,000 for the UNDEERC jointly sponsored research program, in cooperative research and development; and \$1,000,000 for renovation of METC Building 4 in facilities; and decreases of \$250,000 in coal preparation, \$9,000,000 from unobligated balances for generic bench-scale experimental units at Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center (PETC) in coal liquefaction; \$1,114,000 for coprocessing research in direct coal liquefaction; \$2,500,000 for advanced research in combustion systems; \$500,000 for alternative fuels in combustion systems; \$2,000,000 for the Illinois mild gasification facility in coal gasification; \$500,000 for the California Oil and Gas Alliance in advanced extraction and process technology; \$500,000 for the Illinois-Michigan gas atlas in gas resource and extraction; \$500,000 for light hydrocarbons to liquids research in gas utilization; and \$2,800,000 in molten carbonate fuel cells.

The managers agree that:

1. Funds for air toxics in flue gas cleanup are for the facility support described in the House report. If future plans to support Clean Air Act requirements contain additional incremental support for air toxics research above the \$5 million, 5-year program in the House report, it should be carried out on a competitive basis, including such facilities as those at Southern Research Institute, if applicable.

2. That \$625,000 in coal technology export is for initial implementation of section 1332 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992. The managers expect that the funding provided will be used by the Department to identify potential markets for clean coal technologies in developing countries and countries with economies in transition from nonmarket economies and to identify existing, or new, financial mechanisms or financial support to be provided by the Federal government that will enhance the ability of U.S. industry to participate in these markets. The Secretary is to report to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate within six months after the date of enactment of this Act on potential coal technology export markets and the financing mechanisms and/or levels of Federal government support necessary to assist U.S. industry participation in these markets. In addition, the managers expect the Secretary to consider input from U.S. industry in order to assess the potential for U.S. industry participation in the development of clean coal technology projects in the developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

3. That materials development research should be redirected and focused on anticipating and solving high temperature materials problems related to the more advanced fossil energy research and development programs such as Combustion 2000, hot particulate cleanup, and fuel cell activities. Materials development should be focused through a single integrated materials program that emphasizes broad industry and laboratory participation. Institutions and university/industry consortia with a foundation of background knowledge and experience in product design issues for these technologies, such as Argonne National Lab, Pennsylvania State University, West Virginia University, and the Cooperative Research Partnership which concentrates on the non-fuel uses of coal to produce coal derived carbon materials, should be given priority consideration in broadening the participation base.

4. In alternative fuels, the added funds above the budget may be used for either in-

house research or characterization of beneficiated fuels.

5. Including the \$3,000,000 provided in this appropriation, the total amount appropriated to date for the Illinois mild gasification facility is \$9,430,000.

6. The Oil Recovery Technology Partnership program should be expanded to include Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory. On this basis the Partnership activity would also contain \$1,000,000 identified for the California Oil and Gas Alliance. The managers agree with the Senate report language on the operating processes of the Partnership, and these processes should also be applied to the California work as well while assuring a minimum of \$1,000,000 for California projects in fiscal year 1994.

7. Funds provided in advanced extraction and process technology for Gypsy field work by the University of Oklahoma should be for a specific well-defined scope of work within an overall program for the field involving significant non-Federal funding.

8. The Department should plan to complete the Illinois-Michigan basin gas atlas in future years.

9. Within funds provided for molten carbonate fuel cells, no more than \$1,000,000 is to be expended for work not related to stack development or demonstrations. The managers further agree that, if funds are provided in fiscal year 1994 to the Department of Defense for fuel cell demonstrations or research activity as is contemplated in the House-passed Defense appropriations bill, the Department must coordinate its efforts with the Department of Defense so as to minimize duplication and coordinate efforts to assure a program which efficiently uses government funds, particularly with regard to expensive demonstration activity.

10. Within the overall total for jointly sponsored research at UNDEERC, up to \$500,000 may be used for studies of Alaskan energy service options, all of which must be matched on at least a 50-50 basis by non-Federal sources.

11. No funding is contemplated currently for a State-of-the-art version of the High Performance Power system in the research and development program.

12. No reports beyond the one recently issued by the General Accounting Office and the one requested in the fiscal year 1993 Senate report are required for the magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) program. MHD funds that would have been used for the report specified by the Senate should be used to assist in program close-out activities.

13. Requests for not more than \$350,000 for follow-on funding for studies by the University of Oklahoma on the use of liquefied natural gas (LNG) as a fuel for the heavy trucking industry should be considered in the alternative fuels development activity in energy conservation.

Amendment No. 86: Deletes Senate proposed language concerning a procurement for a facility renovation at Morgantown Energy Technology Center (METC). The House had no similar provision.

The managers have recommended an increase of \$1,000,000 in Amendment No. 85 to initiate demolition and begin environmental remediation required for health and safety renovations at METC's Building 4. The managers expect the demolition and renovation to begin in fiscal year 1994, and also expect the Department to include the additional \$3,300,000 required for this high priority health and safety project in its fiscal year 1995 budget request.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Amendment No. 87: Appropriates \$690,375,000 for energy conservation instead

of \$702,825,000 as proposed by the House and \$677,013,000 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase above the amount proposed by the Senate consists of increases of \$500,000 for lighting applications at Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, and \$1,000,000 from an unspecified Senate reduction, both in the lighting and appliances activity in buildings; \$1,000,000 for oil heating research in the heating and cooling equipment activity in buildings; \$250,000 for advanced buildings in the residential sector, and \$562,000 for retrofit technology research, both in the buildings system research activity; \$1,000,000 for industrial waste utilization and conversion to continue existing projects, and \$500,000 in industrial waste minimization, both in industrial wastes; \$500,000 in industrial cogeneration; \$500,000 for continuous fiber ceramic composites in industrial enabling materials; \$2,000,000 for materials development in transportation; \$500,000 for the Sandia Livermore Combustion Research Facility in the heat engine development activity in transportation; \$1,000,000 for integrated resource planning in the utility sector; and \$8,593,000 for low income weatherization grants; and decreases of \$500,000 for metalcasting research in industrial materials processing; \$500,000 for the ongoing PEM (proton exchange membrane) fuel cell program; and \$500,000 for the on-board hydrogen storage PEM fuel cell program, both in electric and hybrid propulsion development in transportation; \$250,000 for joint ventures in technical and financial assistance; \$1,793,000 for training and technical assistance in weatherization; and \$1,000,000 for demand-side management grants in the State energy conservation grant program.

The managers agree that:

1. The Department should encourage and cooperate with utilities and a nationwide utility consortium developing incentive programs for the development of high efficiency clothes washers similar to those programs previously developed for refrigerators. Several manufacturers are development such high efficiency products.

2. The Department of Energy should take advantage of all opportunities to incorporate the best available technologies for energy efficiency in any new or modified buildings, including those built by third parties and leased to the Department or its contractors. Particular emphasis should be placed on windows, lighting, sensors, heating and cooling systems, and automated energy management systems. The managers believe the Department should take every available opportunity to showcase technologies that have been supported by the Energy Conservation appropriation over the past several years.

3. No reductions in the industrial waste minimization program should be applied to the National Industrial Competitiveness through Energy, Environment, and Economics (NICE 3) activity.

4. Pursuant to authorizing legislation the metalcasting competitive research program is designed to raise the productivity of the metalcasting industry through research in materials and process technology. The dissemination of information and education activities based on such research and other advanced technologies on metalcasting should be extended to small and medium-sized casting companies. Accordingly, the solicitation for fiscal year 1994 funds must be for proposals which contain both research and dissemination and education activities that enable the results to be transferred in a manner accessible to these small and medium-sized metalcasting companies.

5. To the extent possible the integrated resource planning activity in the utility sector should include activities encouraging innovative State regulatory authority implementation of demand-side management techniques including participation in proceedings by weatherization program subgrantees as authorized by section 112 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-486).

6. Funding for joint venture activities in the technical and financial assistance area is not for the solicitation of project proposals. This amount will allow detailed planning and more precise definition of activities to be funded under future potential project solicitations. No funding for such solicitation will be considered prior to presentation of more detailed program plans.

7. Distribution of the \$3,000,000 originally provided in fiscal year 1992 for a weatherization incentive fund shall be as described in the Senate report.

Amendment No. 88: Earmarks \$254,025,000 for energy conservation grant programs instead of \$261,325,000 as proposed by the House and \$248,225,000 as proposed by the Senate. The earmark consists of \$206,800,000 for the weatherization assistance program, \$18,310,000 for the State energy conservation program, and \$28,915,000 for the institutional conservation program.

Amendment No. 89: Earmarks \$206,800,000 for the weatherization assistance program instead of \$213,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$200,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment that earmarks \$18,310,000 for the State energy conservation program instead of \$18,810,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,310,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The reduced earmark is based on actions agreed to in Amendment No. 87.

Amendment No. 91: Earmarks \$19,366,000 for steel and aluminum research as proposed by the Senate instead of \$18,091,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 92: Deletes Senate proposed language delineating items allowable for cost-sharing and providing for payback of government funds in steel and aluminum research, and specifying cost-sharing percentages and procedures for protection of proprietary information for battery and hybrid vehicle research. The House had no similar provision.

The managers direct the Department of Energy to continue steel and aluminum research under the same guidelines that have been in place since the inception of the program, and not to implement any changes to cost-sharing criteria or payback requirements without prior consultation with the appropriate Committees of Congress.

SPR PETROLEUM ACCOUNT

Amendment No. 93: Places an outlay ceiling of \$75,580,000 on the use of funds from this account of oil acquisition in fiscal year 1994 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$79,580,000 as proposed by the House.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 94: Appropriates \$86,553,000 for the Energy Information Administration instead of \$86,053,000 as proposed by the House, and \$86,953,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$500,000 over the House is to begin preparation for the collection of greenhouse gas data.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Amendment No. 95: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which waives a thirty-day waiting period for a contract to conduct activities at the Department of Energy's research facilities at Bartlesville, OK. The House had no similar provision.

REVISION OF AMOUNTS FOR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Amendment No. 96: Deletes a general reduction of \$49,764,000 for Fossil energy research and development and a general increase of \$24,873,000 for Energy Conservation contained in the House bill, as proposed by the Senate. Amounts for fossil energy research and development are addressed in Amendment No. 85, and amounts for energy conservation are addressed in Amendment No. 87.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES—INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

Amendment No. 97: Appropriates \$1,645,877,000 for Indian health services instead of \$1,652,394,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,641,592,000 as proposed by the Senate. The changes to the House position include increases in hospitals and clinics of \$1,400,000 in new tribes funding for the Catawba Tribe in South Carolina and \$325,000 for the Tulsa, Oklahoma operating unit, and an increase in alcohol and substance abuse of \$135,000 to fund the Gila River regional youth treatment center at 75 percent of need, consistent with the other regional treatment centers. The increases are offset by decreases in hospitals and clinics of \$50,000 for improved health services for the Shoalwater Bay Tribe of Washington, \$50,000 for AIDS treatment and \$5,977,000, which is transferred to the facilities account, to bring operating units to 60 percent of the level of need funded. There are also decreases of \$100,000 in mental health for the Bay Mills child sexual abuse treatment and prevention program, which leaves the funding for that program at the fiscal year 1993 level; \$900,000 in community health representatives; \$800,000 in direct operations; and \$500,000 in contract support costs for new and expanded contracts funded through the Indian self-determination fund.

The managers agree that:

1. A total of \$680,000 is to be made available for the Shoalwater Bay Tribe of Washington and should remain in the base for future budgets;

2. IHS should continue to work with the Mississippi Choctaw Tribe to ensure sufficient funds are provided for the tuberculosis program;

3. Funds allocated by the IHS to the Tulsa, Oklahoma clinic may be used for expanded lease space, consistent with the IHS lease priority system;

4. A portion of the California share of the increase above the budget request for contract health services may be used for the California contract health demonstration project to the extent the tribes in that area agree to such a use.

5. IHS should work with the Department of the Interior to review carefully contract support cost requirements, and report to the Committees on the results of that review, including any suggested improvements to the current procedures for estimating these costs; and

6. The IHS needs to work closely with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to develop a cost ef-

fective, integrated approach to dealing with child abuse in Indian country; the fiscal year 1995 budget request for each agency should make this program a high priority.

Amendment No. 98: Earmarks \$7,500,000 for the self-determination fund instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates \$296,982,000 for Indian health facilities instead of \$296,997,000 as proposed by the House and \$293,682,000 as proposed by the Senate. The changes in the House-recommended level include increases of \$300,000 in new and replacement hospitals for planning of the Winnebago hospital in Nebraska; \$5,977,000 which is transferred from the hospital and clinics account to bring operating units to 60 percent of the level of need funded; and, in outpatient care facilities, \$708,000 for planning of the Second Mesa health center in Arizona and \$500,000 each for site work at the Fort Belknap and White Earth health centers in Montana. The increases are offset by decreases of \$7,000,000 in maintenance and improvement, \$500,000 in dental units, and \$500,000 in injury prevention.

The managers agree that:

1. The \$5,977,000 transferred from hospitals and clinics should be placed in a new budget subactivity titled: "Facilities/Space for Increase in Level of Need Funded";

2. The \$465,000 unobligated balance remaining from the Phoenix area regional youth treatment center project may be used for planning and construction of a satellite facility at an alternate site in Nevada in keeping with the original agreement for servicing that area; and

3. While there is no increase above the budget request for sanitation facilities, IHS should work with the tribes in the Navajo area and the Yukon-Kuskokwim region of Alaska to ensure the extraordinary needs in those areas are appropriately integrated in the sanitation deficiency priority system.

The managers are aware of several potential reprogramming needs within IHS, including funds to conduct feasibility studies and site surveys for projects awaiting placement in the facilities construction priority system, to purchase land for expansion of the Gallup Indian Medical Center, and to standardize hospital and clinic designs. The managers support these efforts and are ready to approve reprogrammings for them to the extent existing projects are completed at less than the originally estimated costs. The managers suggest that, in line with the Vice President's National Performance Review, IHS managers be empowered to make these funding realignments, with advance notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, and that the processing of these reprogrammings through the bureaucracy be accomplished in a matter of days rather than over several months as has been the norm in the past.

Amendment No. 100: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Retain the matter proposed by said amendment amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: \$300,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The amendment precludes the use of planning funds for the Winnebago Hospital in Nebraska until a program justification docu-

ment has been approved. The House had no similar provision. The Senate had proposed \$500,000 in planning funds and the managers have agreed to provide \$300,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Amendment No. 101: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which allows the use of funds to renovate existing buildings to meet additional space requirements. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 102: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: *Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously or herein made available to a tribe or tribal organization through a contract, grant or agreement authorized by Title I of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (88 Stat. 2203; 25 U.S.C. 450), may be deobligated and reobligated to a self-governance funding agreement under Title III of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The amendment deletes a House provision, stricken by the Senate, requiring approval of staffing reductions by the Committees on Appropriations and inserts a provision permitting the transfer of funds from existing tribal contracts to self-governance compacts.

The managers stress that the necessary personnel resources must be made available to ensure that there are sufficient health professionals at each IHS hospital and outpatient facility. It is unrealistic to assume that IHS can provide needed staff with contract rather than in-house personnel. The managers expect the IHS to keep the Committees fully informed of any proposed personnel reductions or realignments following the established reprogramming procedures. Further, the managers encourage both the Department of Health and Human Services and the Office of Management and Budget to exempt the increased staff needed for new and expanded IHS facilities from the baseline on which government-wide staffing reductions are assessed. The managers also note that the vast majority of IHS personnel in high-graded positions are physicians and believe any staffing reductions in the higher graded positions should not be applied to physician and health professional positions.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

INDIAN EDUCATION

Amendment No. 103: Appropriates \$83,500,000 for Indian education as proposed by the House instead of \$83,405,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 104: Appropriates \$26,936,000 for the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as proposed by the House instead of \$28,436,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funding for housing improvements in

the Bennett Freeze area is addressed under the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Amendment No. 44.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 105: Appropriates \$302,349,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$302,083,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 106: Provides that \$24,552,000 shall remain available until expended as proposed by the Senate instead of \$27,579,000 as proposed by the House.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 107: Appropriates \$140,836,000 for grants and administration as proposed by the Senate instead of \$137,228,450 as proposed by the House.

MATCHING GRANTS

Amendment No. 108: Appropriates \$29,392,000 for matching grants as proposed by the Senate instead of \$28,634,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 109: Earmarks \$12,858,000 for challenge grants as proposed by the Senate instead of \$13,187,000 as proposed by the House.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

The managers agree to the distribution of funds proposed by the House which includes \$250,000 more for the National Heritage Preservation Program than proposed by the Senate. The Senate had included \$250,000 more than the House for the U.S. Newspaper program.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 110: Deletes House language which prohibits continuation of the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities as proposed by the Senate.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 111: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that funds appropriated to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission in fiscal year 1993 shall remain available until expended. The House had no similar provision.

The managers also have provided \$11,000,000 in the National Park Service construction account to continue construction of the memorial.

PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 112: Appropriates \$4,289,000 for public development as proposed by the House instead of \$4,389,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 113: Deletes House proposed language stricken by the Senate which would have prohibited the use of funds in this Act for any sale of unprocessed timber to be exported by the purchaser from Federal lands in the State of Texas.

Amendment No. 114: Deletes House-proposed provision establishing a monetary floor for payments from timber receipts to States for National Forests affected by decisions related to the Northern Spotted Owl, as proposed by the Senate. Such payments

have been addressed in Public Law 103-66, the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

Amendment No. 115: Deletes House-proposed provision establishing a monetary floor for payments to Oregon and California land grant counties, based on timber receipts, as proposed by the Senate. Such payments have been addressed in Public Law 103-66, the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

Amendment No. 116: Deletes House provision, stricken by the Senate, which would have made the Speaker of the House a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

Amendment No. 117: Restores House-proposed provision on compliance with the Buy American Act which was stricken by the Senate and changes the section number.

Amendment No. 118: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Retain the matter inserted by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert: 314

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment provides for timber salvage sales in the Pacific Northwest on Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands, subject to existing environmental and forest management laws, and changes the section number.

Amendment No. 119: Deletes Senate provision prohibiting the use of funds to initiate projects with total cost in excess of \$500,000 unless provided for in the budget justifications or in the appropriations bill and/or reports. The managers remain concerned about the explosion of new proposals which carry significant outyear cost implications, but which have not gone through the budget review process. While many of these types of proposals may be well-intentioned, they must be considered in the context of the overall budget. Available discretionary dollars will become more and more constrained in the years ahead, and it is imperative that parties interested in the programs funded in the bill understand that requests for additional funding will increasingly have to come at the expense of other projects in the budget, including base operational funds. At a time when many agencies are highlighting the constraints of the operational base, the managers believe it important that the linkage between these matters be recognized and understood.

Amendment No. 120: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Retain the matter inserted by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the Section number named in said amendment, insert: 315

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment limits funding for sales of giant sequoias pending completion of a management implementation plan, and changes the section number.

Amendment No. 121: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Retain the matter inserted by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the Section number named in said amendment, insert: 316

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment limits increases in government housing rental rates to no more than 10 per cent of the rental rates which were in effect on September 1, 1993.

Amendment No. 122: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have amended the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to provide a new definition of the term "rural community". The House had no similar provision. The language has been passed as a separate bill by both the House and the Senate, and it is not necessary to carry this provision in this Act.

Amendment No. 123: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 317. GRAZING.

Title IV of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) is amended by adding the following new sections:

"SEC. 405. GRAZING FEES.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall annually establish grazing fees.

"(b) PHASE-IN.—The grazing fee for the grazing years 1994, 1995, and 1996 shall be as follows:

"(1) Grazing Fee for 1994=\$2.39 per AUM

"(2) Grazing Fee for 1995=\$2.92 per AUM

"(3) Grazing Fee for 1996=\$3.45 per AUM

"(c) CALCULATION.—Beginning in the grazing year 1997, the grazing fee per AUM shall be equal to a \$3.45 base value multiplied by the forage value index computed annually from data supplied by the National Agricultural Statistics Service, in accordance with the following formula:

"Grazing Fee per AUM=\$3.45 Forage Value Index

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term, 'Forage Value Index (FVI)' means the average estimate (weighted by AUMs) of the annual rental charge per AUM for pasturing cattle on private rangelands in the 17 contiguous Western States (Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming) divided by \$8.67 (average for the years 1990, 1991, and 1992); and

"(2) the term 'Animal Unit Month (AUM)' means the amount of forage necessary for the sustenance of 1 cow or its equivalent for a period of 1 month.

"(e) INCREASES OR DECREASES.—Any annual increase or decrease in the grazing fee occurring after 1996 shall be limited to not more than 15 percent of the fee in the previous year.

"(f) LANDS AFFECTED.—Fees shall be charged for livestock grazing upon or crossing the public lands and other lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the National Forest System lands in the 17 contiguous Western States, excluding the National Forests in Texas, at a specified rate per animal unit month.

"(g) GRAZING AFFECTED.—The full fee shall be charged for each paying animal unit which is defined as each animal 6 months of age or over at the time of entering the public lands, or National Forest System lands, for all weaned animals regardless of age, and for such animals as will become 12 months of age during the authorized period of use. No charge will be made for animals under 6 months of age at the time of entering the public lands, or National Forest System lands, that are the natural progeny of animals upon which fees are paid, provided they

will not become 12 months of age during the authorized period of use, or for progeny born during that period.

"SEC. 406. RANGELAND REFORM.

"(a) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall promulgate regulations to establish payment dates, late fee assessments, and service charges for the grazing fee established pursuant to section 405 of this Act and as provided for in section 4130.7-3 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations.

"(b) EXECUTIVE ORDER.—Executive Order No. 12548 (43 U.S.C. 1905 note) shall not apply to grazing fees established after the date of enactment of this section.

"(c) PROPOSED DECISIONS AND APPEALS ON PERMITS OR LEASES.—The Secretary of the Interior shall issue regulations providing for decisions and appeals of final decisions on grazing permits or leases. Such regulations shall provide the following:

"(1) CHANGES IN LIVESTOCK MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.—After consultation, reductions of permitted use or changes in livestock management practices necessary to protect rangeland ecosystem health shall be implemented through a documented agreement or by decision of the authorized officer. Determinations regarding the ecological health of ecosystems or the actions necessary to achieve healthy ecosystems shall be based on the standards and guidelines promulgated pursuant to subsection (o), or monitoring, inventory, or other forage production data acceptable to the authorized officer.

"(2) OTHER CHANGES.—When the authorized officer determines that the soil, vegetation, or other resources on the public lands require protection because of conditions such as drought, fire, flood, or insect infestation, or when continued grazing use poses a significant risk of resource damage from these factors, after consultation with, or a reasonable attempt to consult with affected permittees or lessees, other interested parties, and the State having lands or responsible for managing resources within the area, the authorized officer shall close allotments or portions of allotments to grazing by any kind of livestock, or modify authorized grazing use. Notices of closure and decisions requiring modification of authorized grazing use may be issued as final decisions effective upon issuance or on the date specified in the decision. Such decisions shall remain in effect pending the decision on appeal unless a stay is granted by the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

"(d) WATER RIGHTS.—Subject to valid water rights existing on the date of enactment, no water rights shall be obtained for grazing-related actions on public lands except in the name of the United States.

"(e) SUBLEASING.—A leasing surcharge shall be added by the Secretary of the Interior to the grazing fee billings for authorized leasing of base property to which public land grazing preference is attached or authorized grazing of livestock owned by persons other than the permittee or lessee. The surcharge shall be in addition to any other fees that may be charged for using public land forage. Surcharges shall be paid for grazing use calculated in accordance with the following:

"(1) 20 percent of the grazing bill for the permitted grazing use that is attached to a leased base property by an approved transfer, or that was leased and attached to the base property of another party through an approved transfer.

"(2) 50 percent of the grazing bill for pasturing livestock owned by persons other than the permittee or lessee under a grazing authorization.

"(3) 70 percent of the grazing bill when base property is leased and a transfer has been approved and livestock owned by persons other than the permittee or lessee are pastured under a grazing authorization.

"(f) UNAUTHORIZED GRAZING USE.—

"(1) VIOLATIONS.—

"(A) Violation of section 4140.1(b)(1) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, constitutes unauthorized grazing use.

"(B) The authorized officer shall determine whether a violation is nonwillful, willful, or repeated willful.

"(C) Violators shall be liable in damages to the United States for the forage consumed by their livestock, for injury to public lands and other property of the United States caused by their unauthorized grazing use, and for expenses incurred in impoundment and disposal of their livestock, and may be subject to civil penalties or criminal sanction for such unlawful acts.

"(2) NOTICE AND ORDER TO REMOVE.—

"(A) Whenever a violation has been determined to be nonwillful and incidental, and the owner of the unauthorized livestock is known, the authorized officer shall notify the alleged violator that a violation has been reported, that the violation must be corrected, and how it can be settled, based upon the discretion of the authorized officer.

"(B) Whenever it appears that a violation exists and the owner of the unauthorized livestock is known, written notice of unauthorized use and order to remove livestock by a specified date shall be served upon the alleged violator or the agent of record, or both, by certified mail or personal delivery. The written notice shall also allow a specified time from receipt of notice for the alleged violator to show that there has been no violation or to make settlement under paragraph (3).

"(C) When neither the owner of the unauthorized livestock nor his agent is known, the authorized officer may proceed to impound the livestock under paragraph (3).

"(3) SETTLEMENT.—

"(A) The authorized officer shall determine whether the violation is nonwillful, willful, or repeated willful. Where violations are repeated willful, the authorized officer shall take action under section 4170.1-1(b) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations. The amount due for settlement shall include the value of forage consumed as determined under subparagraph (B). Settlement for willful and repeated willful violations shall also include the full value for all damages to the public lands and other property of the United States, and all reasonable expenses incurred by the United States in detecting, investigating, resolving violations, and livestock impoundment costs.

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the value of forage consumed shall be determined as follows:

"(i) For nonwillful violations, the value of forage consumed as determined by the average monthly rate per AUM for pasturing livestock on privately owned land (excluding irrigated land) for the 17 Western States as published annually by the Department of Agriculture. The authorized officer may approve nonmonetary settlement of unauthorized use when the authorized officer determines that each of the following conditions are met:

"(I) Evidence shows that the unauthorized use occurred through no fault of the livestock operator.

"(II) The forage use is insignificant.

"(III) The public lands have not been damaged.

"(IV) Nonmonetary settlement is in the best interests of the United States.

"(ii) For willful violations, twice the value of forage consumed as determined in clause (i) of this paragraph.

"(iii) For repeated willful violations, three times the value of the forage consumed as determined in clause (i) of this paragraph.

"(iv) Payment made under this paragraph does not relieve the alleged violator of any criminal liability under Federal or State law.

"(v) Violators shall not be authorized to make grazing use on the public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management until any amount found to be due the United States under this section has been paid. The authorized officer may take action under section 4160.1-2 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, to cancel or suspend grazing authorizations or to deny approval of applications for grazing use until such amounts have been paid. The proposed decision shall include a demand for payment.

"(g) RESOURCE ADVISORY COUNCILS.—

"(1) One or more resource advisory councils, as provided for in section 309, shall be established for the area within the jurisdiction of each Bureau of Land Management State Office to provide guidance on the management of public lands and resources.

"(2) The Secretary or a designee of the Secretary shall appoint not less than 10 nor more than 15 members to serve on each resource advisory council. One appointee of each resource advisory council shall be an official elected to a position in State or local government serving the people of the area for which the council is established.

"(3) A resource advisory council advises the Bureau of Land Management official to whom it reports regarding multiple use plans and programs for public lands and resources within its area.

"(4) A resource advisory council and its subcommittees shall meet at the call of the designated Federal officer and elect their own officers. The designated Federal officer shall attend all meetings of the council and its subcommittees.

"(5) Administrative support for a resource advisory council and its subcommittees shall be provided by the office of the designated Federal officer.

"(h) RANGE IMPROVEMENT FUND.—

"(1) With respect to public lands, in addition to range developments accomplished through other resources management funds, authorized range improvement may be secured through the use of the appropriated range improvement fund provided for by section 401 of this Act. One-half of the available funds shall be expended in the State and district from which they were derived. The remaining one-half of the fund shall be allocated, on a priority basis, by the Secretary or designee for on-the-ground ecosystem rehabilitation, protection and improvement.

"(2) All appropriated funds for range improvement are to be used for cost-effective investment in improvements that benefit all rangeland resources, including riparian area rehabilitation, improvement, and protection, fish and wildlife habitat improvement, wild horse and burro habitat management facilities, vegetation improvement and management, and livestock grazing management. The funds may be used for activities including the planning, design, layout, modification, and monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of specific range improvement projects.

"(3) During the planning of the range development or range improvement programs, authorized officers shall consult affected permittees, lessees, and other interested parties.

"(i) RANGE IMPROVEMENT OWNERSHIP.—

"(1) With respect to public lands, any permittee or lessee may apply for a range improvement permit to install, use, maintain, or modify range improvements that are needed to achieve management objectives within his or her designated allotment. The permittee or lessee shall agree to provide full funding for construction, installation, modification, or maintenance. Such range improvement permit may be issued at the discretion of the authorized officer.

"(2) The permittee or lessee may hold the title to all temporary range improvements authorized as livestock handling facilities such as corrals and dipping vats and temporary, readily removable improvements such as troughs for hauled water. The authorization for permanent water developments, such as spring developments, wells, reservoirs, stock tanks, and pipelines, shall be through cooperative range improvement agreements to protect the public interest for multiple use of rangeland ecosystems. The United States shall assert its claims and exercise its rights to water developed on public lands to benefit the public lands and resources thereon.

"(3) Where a permittee or lessee cannot make use of the forage available for livestock and an application for nonuse has been denied or the opportunity to make use of the available forage is requested by the authorized officer, the permittee or lessee shall cooperate with the temporary authorized use of forage by another operator, when it is authorized by the authorized officer following consultation with the preference permittee or lessee.

"(4) A permittee or lessee shall be reasonably compensated for the use and maintenance of improvements and facilities by the operator who has an authorization for temporary grazing use.

"(5) The authorized officer may mediate disputes about reasonable compensation and, following consultation with the interested parties, make a determination concerning the fair and reasonable share of operation and maintenance expenses and compensation for use of improvements and facilities.

"(6) Where a settlement cannot be reached, the authorized officer shall issue a temporary grazing authorization including appropriate terms and conditions and the requirement to compensate the preference permittee or lessee for the fair share of operation and maintenance as determined by the authorized officer under subpart 4160 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations.

"(j) MANDATORY QUALIFICATIONS.—

"(1) Except as provided in sections 4110.1-1, 4130.3, and 4130.4-3 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, to qualify for a grazing permit or lease on the public lands an applicant must own or control land or water base property, and must be—

"(A) a citizen of the United States or have properly filed a valid declaration of intention to become a citizen or a valid petition for naturalization;

"(B) a group or association authorized to conduct business in the State in which the grazing use is sought, all members of which are qualified under subparagraph (A); or

"(C) a corporation authorized to conduct business in the State in which the grazing use is sought.

"(2) Any applicant who currently holds or has previously held a Federal grazing permit or lease, either directly or indirectly, must be determined by the authorized officer to have a satisfactory record of performance.

"(3) The applicant and any affiliate must at the time of permit or lease issuance be determined by the authorized officer to be in substantial compliance with the terms and conditions of any Federal or State grazing permit or lease presently held and with the rules and regulations applicable to those permits and leases. The authorized officer may take into consideration circumstances beyond the control of the applicant or affiliate in determining whether the applicant or affiliate, if any, are in compliance with existing permit or lease terms and conditions and applicable rules and regulations.

"(4) Any applicant or affiliate who has had any Federal or State grazing permit or lease canceled for violation of the permit or lease within the 36 calendar months immediately pre-

ceding the date of application shall be deemed to have an unsatisfactory performance record.

"(5) In determining whether affiliation exists, the authorized officer shall consider all appropriate factors, including, but not limited to, common ownership, common management, identity of interests among family members, and contractual relationships.

"(6) Applicants shall submit an application and any other information requested by the authorized officer in order to determine that all qualifications have been met.

"(k) SUSPENDED NONUSE.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to remove references in existing regulations to long-term suspended nonuse.

"(l) PROHIBITED ACTS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations which would make violations of the Wild Horse and Burro Act, Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and other Federal or State laws concerning conservation, protection of natural or cultural resources, and protection of environmental quality prohibited acts. Upon the expiration of appeal or review periods following a conviction for violation or an administrative finding of violation of these laws the authorized officer may consider cancellation or suspension of permits and leases when the violation occurred on public land or is found to be related to authorized grazing of public land.

"(m) RANGE IMPROVEMENTS.—Subject to valid rights existing on the date of enactment of this section, all rights to permanent improvements contained on or in public lands are vested in the United States.

"(n) CONSERVATION NONUSE.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to authorize persons or entities owning or controlling base property which is capable of serving as a base for livestock use of public lands to apply for up to 10 consecutive years of conservation use of a permit or lease, and up to 3 consecutive years of temporary nonuse.

"(o) STANDARDS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall develop standards and guidelines that establish minimum conditions for the protection of rangeland ecological health. These standards and guidelines shall be promulgated pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, to the extent each is applicable. Permits and leases shall incorporate applicable standards and guidelines to ensure the proper management of public rangelands. These standards and guidelines shall provide for—

"(1) the restoration and protection of riparian values, such as healthy wildlife and fish habitat and diverse vegetation;

"(2) compliance with the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

"(3) compliance with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

"(4) restoration, maintenance, and improvement of ecosystem health, such as diversity, resilience, and sustainability."

SEC. 318. USE OF FUNDS.

Except as provided by this Act, none of the funds made available to the Secretary of the Interior by this Act may be used to implement any grazing reform program, including a grazing fee increase, unless Congress has approved such program or fee increase. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Secretary from promulgating regulations, modifying existing regulations, or taking other actions, as necessary, to implement the provisions of sections 405 and 406 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 as added by this Act.

SEC. 319. REPEAL.

Section 403 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1753) is repealed.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The original Senate amendment placed a moratorium on changes in grazing fees and changes in grazing management practices. The House had no similar provision.

The amendment agreed to by the managers provides for the following:

(1) Increases in grazing fees for public lands and National Forest System lands from the current level of \$1.86 per animal unit month (AUM) to \$2.39 per AUM in 1994; \$2.92 per AUM in 1995; and \$3.45 per AUM in 1996.

(2) After 1996 the grazing fee will be adjusted by a Forage Value Index defined in the law, subject to a maximum increase or decrease of 15% each year.

(3) grazing management reforms can only be implemented to the extent approved by Congress, including the following items:

(a) range management decisions on permits or leases are effective on the date of issuance, unless a stay is granted pending action on an appeal.

(b) all water rights accrue to the United States, subject to valid water rights existing upon enactment.

(c) the government will collect a surcharge of from 20 to 70 percent from permittees who sublease to third parties.

(d) unauthorized use violations are subject to either monetary or nonmonetary penalties.

(e) grazing advisory boards are replaced by resource advisory boards with broader representation.

(f) the use of range improvement funds is expanded.

(g) title to permanent range improvements accrues to the United States subject to valid rights existing upon enactment.

(h) permittees who have had a Federal or State permit or lease cancelled for violations may not obtain another permit for 36 months.

(i) suspended non-use on allotments is deleted as a concept.

(j) willful violations of certain environmental laws may be cause for cancellation of permits or leases, after expiration of appeal or review periods, if they affect public lands or are related to grazing on public lands.

(k) periods of non-use for conservation purposes are authorized.

(l) national standards are to be developed through the normal regulatory process.

Amendment No. 124: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 320. FOREST SERVICE SEPARATION PAY.—

(a) In order to avoid or minimize the need for involuntary separations, effective for the period beginning upon the date of enactment of this Act through and including September 30, 1994, the Secretary of Agriculture, under such regulations and subject to such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, shall have authority to offer separation pay to employees of the Forest Service to the same extent the Secretary of Defense is authorized to offer separation pay to employees of a defense agency in section 5597 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) In the event that an authority is enacted to offer separation pay or a voluntary separation incentive similar to such section 5597 of title 5, United States Code, but applicable to employees in the executive branch generally, the authority under subsection (a) shall terminate.

(c) Such payments may be made to employees who agree, during a continuous 90 day period designated by the agency head, beginning no earlier than the date of enactment of this Act and ending no later than September 30, 1994, to separate from service with the agency, whether by retirement or resignation.

(d) An employee who has received a voluntary separation incentive under this section and accepts employment with the Government of the United States within 2 years of the date of the separation on which payment of the incentive is based shall be required to repay the entire amount of the incentive to the agency that paid the incentive.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The amendment provides authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to offer separation pay to employees of the Forest Service, in order to minimize the need for involuntary separations. Under the President's Forest Plan in the Pacific Northwest, as well as for other reasons in other areas of the country, the Forest Service will have to reduce the number of its employees significantly during fiscal year 1994, and without this authority, a large portion of the 1994 budget could be required for the costs of a Reduction-in-Force. With this authority, savings of \$25,000,000 could be achieved, compared to the cost of a RIF. The language also provides that this authority will terminate when government-wide authority is enacted into law. The language also provides for full repayment of any payment received under this authority if the employee receiving the payment is reemployed with the Government within two years of the separation date.

Amendment No. 125: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 321. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to implement the Bureau of Land Management/United States Forest Service comprehensive strategy for Pacific salmon and steelhead habitat (PACFISH) or to impose interim guidelines for such strategy in the Tongass National Forest: Provided, That nothing in this section shall be construed to enlarge or diminish minimum timber no harvest buffer zones required by the Tongass Timber Reform Act or to enlarge or diminish site-specific management prescriptions which increase no harvest fish stream buffer zones applied under the Tongass Land Management Plan and existing standards and guidelines of the Tongass National Forest.

And on page 52, line 21 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2520, strike "\$150,000 on October 1, 1993, \$250,000,000" and insert "\$125,000,000 on October 1, 1993, \$275,000,000"

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment on the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The managers recognize that Alaska is the only State which has statutory minimum no harvest buffer zones on State, private, and Federal lands resulting from Federal and State laws. For this reason and because of the differences between the existing good condition of anadromous fish habitat in Alaska and other areas of the country, the managers have revised Senate proposed language to prohibit implementation of the PACFISH strategy in Alaska in 1994. The language also clarifies that this prohibition does not apply to any management prescriptions involving anadromous fish habitat

under current standards and guidelines in the Tongass NF.

The managers recognize that more studies are needed prior to making any decisions on implementing the strategy in Alaska. The Forest Service therefore should proceed with stream analyses and studies and review procedures related to the PACFISH strategy in 1994 in order to study the effectiveness of the current procedures, such as buffer strips, and to determine if any additional protection is needed. The Forest Service should provide an interim report on studies conducted to date to the Appropriations Committees by April 1, 1994. Funding for such studies and analyses shall come from salvage funds identified previously for that purpose and other programs such as soil, water and air, and research.

The amendment also reduces the amounts of funds available for the fifth round of projects in the Department of Energy's clean coal technology account in fiscal year 1994 by \$25,000,000 to \$125,000,000. The funds are to be made available in fiscal year 1995.

APPLICATION OF GENERAL REDUCTIONS

The level at which reductions shall be taken pursuant to the Deficit Reduction Act of 1985, if such reductions are required in fiscal year 1994, is defined by the managers as follows:

As provided for by section 256(1)(2) of Public Law 99-177, as amended, and for the purposes of a Presidential Order issued pursuant to section 254 of said Act, the term "program, project, and activity" for items under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the House of Representatives and the Senate is defined as (1) any item specifically identified in tables or written material set forth in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, or accompanying committee reports or the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference; (2) any Government-owned or Government-operated facility; and (3) management units, such as national parks, national forests, fish hatcheries, wildlife refuges, research units, regional, State and other administrative units and the like, for which funds are provided in fiscal year 1994.

The managers emphasize that any item for which a specific dollar amount is mentioned in an accompanying report, including all increases over the budget estimate approved by the Committees, shall be subject to a percentage reduction no greater or less than the percentage reduction applied to all domestic discretionary accounts.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1994 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1993 amount, the 1994 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1994 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993	\$12,199,956,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994	13,617,688,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994	12,685,169,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994	13,346,699,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1994	13,388,038,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993	+\$1,188,082,000

Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994	-229,650,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994	+702,869,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994	+41,339,000

SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOHN P. MURTHA,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
TOM BEVILL,
DAVID E. SKAGGS,
RONALD D. COLEMAN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
RALPH REGULA,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
JIM KOLBE

(except for amendments Nos. 16, 17, 18, and 123),
RON PACKARD
(except for amendments Nos. 16, 17, 18, and 123),

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,
DENNIS DECONCINI,
DALE BUMPERS,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
HARRY REID,
PATTY MURRAY,
DON NICKLES,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
MARK O. HATFIELD,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

Mr. CLEMENT (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. ORTON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of family obligations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIVINGSTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BATEMAN, for 60 minutes each day, on October 20 and 21.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TALENT, for 60 minutes each day, on November 3, 10, 17, and 23.

Mr. DORNAN, for 60 minutes each day, on November 17 and 23.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KANJORSKI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KOPETSKI, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. THORNTON, for 60 minutes, on October 20.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIVINGSTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COBLE.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. FAWELL.
Mrs. BENTLEY in two instances.
Mr. BAKER of California.
Mr. GOODLING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KANJORSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MALONEY in two instances.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. BORSKI.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Ms. DELAURO in two instances.
Ms. PELOSI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. MFUME.
Mr. KENNEDY.
Mr. DELLUMS.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.
Mr. MCDERMOTT.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 537. An act for the relief of Tania Gil Compton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 760. An act for the relief of Leteane Monatsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2399. An act to provide for the settlement of land claims of the Catawba Tribe of Indians in the State of South Carolina and the restoration of the Federal trust relationship with the Tribe, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2493. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1993, and October 16, 1994, each as World Food Day.

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to designate October 19, 1993, as "National Mammography Day."

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to designate the month of October 1993 as "National Down Syndrome Awareness Month."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 18, 1993, at 12 noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources, Senate Joint Resolution 78. An act designating the beach at 53 degrees 53'51"N, 166 degrees 34'15"W to 53 degrees 53'48"N, 166 degrees 34'21"W on Hog Island, which lies in the Northeast Bay of Unalaska, AK, as "Arkansas Beach" in commemoration of the 206th regiment of the National Guard, who served during the Japanese attack on Dutch Harbor, Unalaska, on June 3 and 4, 1942 (Rept. 103-294). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 276. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-295). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAMILTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 3225. A bill to support the transition to nonracial democracy in South Africa; with an amendment (Rept. 103-296 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAMILTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 3000. A bill for reform in emerging new democracies and support and help for improved partnership with Russia, Ukraine, and other new independent states of the former Soviet Union; with an amendment (Rept. 103-297 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. YATES: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2520. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-299). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 881. A bill to prohibit smoking in Federal buildings; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Government Operations for a period ending not later than November 12, 1993, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee pursuant to clause 1(j), rule X (Rept. 103-298, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. SPENCE):

H.R. 3292. A bill to prohibit funding for the involvement of the United States Armed Forces in Somalia after January 31, 1994; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Rules, and Armed Services.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LEVY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KING, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 3293. A bill to prohibit the imposition of additional charges or fees for attendance at the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, the U.S. Air Force Academy, the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3294. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include services provided at any Federally qualified health center by interns and residents in a medical residency training program of a hospital in determining the amount of payment to the hospital under the Medicare Program for the costs of graduate medical education if the hospital incurs any of the costs of providing the services, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BORSKI:

H.R. 3295. A bill to improve the ability of the Federal Government to prepare for and respond to major disasters, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 3296. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to insure mortgages given to secure loans that are made to refinance single-family homes having appraised values that are less than the outstanding principal obligations refinanced; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MORELLA:

H.R. 3297. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the treatment currently afforded to Federal judges under the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Program to certain other judicial officials;

to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. WATERS

H.R. 3298. A bill to amend title XII of the National Housing Act to establish a national property reinsurance program to ensure the availability and affordability of property insurance in underserved areas; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas:

H.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution designating the week of March 21 through 27, 1994, as "National Long-Term Care Administrators Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONDIT (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, and Mr. GOODLING):

H. Res. 277. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives respecting unfunded mandates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KASICH (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 278. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit Members, in specified circumstances, to vote by secure electronic device from their districts; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. GILCHREST introduced a bill (H.R. 3299) to clear certain impediments to the licensing of a vessel for employment in the coastwise trade and fisheries of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 323: Mr. LEVY.
H.R. 401: Mr. GINGRICH.
H.R. 493: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.
H.R. 794: Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. MACHTLEY.
H.R. 796: Ms. SHEPHERD.
H.R. 825: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 830: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1056: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. RAVENEL.
H.R. 1133: Mr. BARGIA of Michigan, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. GOSS, Ms. LONG, Mr. KLINK, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1322: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DEAL, Mr. FISH, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1424: Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 1609: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1627: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 1889: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 1924: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 1938: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1999: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ORTON, Mr. COX, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2043: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.
H.R. 2226: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 2292: Mr. WASHINGTON and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2308: Mr. RUSH, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2415: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 2447: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 2727: Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 2884: Mr. GILLMOR and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 2953: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HERGER, Mr. COX, and Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 3024: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 3030: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3041: Mr. KLEIN.
H.R. 3084: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3125: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 3173: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. McMILLAN.

H.R. 3208: Mr. LaFALCE.
H.R. 3284: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LINDER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Ms. DUNN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. EWING, Mr. HOKE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. McHUGH.

H.J. Res. 113: Mr. SPENCE.
H.J. Res. 145: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.J. Res. 205: Mr. FARR, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.J. Res. 216: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LAROCOCO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.J. Res. 242: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.J. Res. 246: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REED, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 256: Mr. PACKARD.
H.J. Res. 268: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 272: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SABO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KASICH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H. Con. Res. 135: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BARLOW, and Mr. FISH.

H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. WALSH.

H. Res. 33: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 237: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Res. 239: Mr. PORTMAN.
H. Res. 247: Mr. PACKARD and Mr. GUNDERSON.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXVII, the following discharge petitions were filed:

Petition 7, October 14, 1993, by Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota on House Joint Resolution 146 has been signed by the following Member: Collin C. Peterson.

Petition 8, October 14, 1993, by Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota on House Resolution 125 has been signed by the following Member: Collin C. Peterson.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. SOLOMON on H.R. 493: Joe Skeen, Curt Weldon, Jan Meyers, Dan Burton, and Gary A. Franks.

Petition 3 by Mr. MCCOLLUM on House Joint Resolution 38: Gary A. Franks.

Petition 4 by Mr. HOEKSTRA on House Joint Resolution 9: Joe Skeen, Doug Bereuter, Bill Barrett, David A. Levy, Peter T. King, Jan Meyers, and Ike Skelton.

Petition 5 by Mr. STEARNS on House Resolution 156: Michael N. Castle, Gary A. Franks, and Stephen Horn.

Petition 6 by Mr. SENSENBRENNER on H.R. 1025: George J. Hochbrueckner, Constance A. Morella, Peter G. Torkildsen, and Stephen Horn.